

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County



305 E. WALNUT STREET
P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
Patrick Buckley, Chair
Andy Nicholson, Vice Chairman
Bill Clancy, Guy Zima, Patrick Evans

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 10, 2017

5:00 P.M.

Brown County Jail

3030 Curry Lane, Green Bay, WI

**** NOTE TIME & LOCATION ****

(TOUR OF JAIL FACILITIES @ 4:30 PM)

Wisconsin Statute §59.54(15) Annual Inspection. At least once each year the board of each county, or a committee thereof, shall visit, inspect and examine each jail maintained by the county, as to health, cleanliness and discipline, and the keeper of the jail shall lay before the board or the committee a calendar setting forth the name, age and cause of committal of each prisoner. If it appears to the board or committee that any provisions of law have been violated or neglected, the board or the committee shall immediately give notice of the violation to the district attorney of the county.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE COMMITTEE MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM LISTED ON THE AGENDA

- I. Call meeting to order.
- II. Approve/Modify Agenda.
- III. Approve/Modify Minutes of March 1, 2017.

Comments from the Public.

1. **Review Minutes of:**
 - a. Criminal Justice Coordinating Board (January 26 and March 23, 2017).
 - b. Fire Investigation Task Force Board of Directors (December 8, 2016).
 - c. Fire Investigation Task Force General Membership (December 1, 2016).
 - d. Local Emergency Planning Committee – LEPC (March 14, 2017).
 - e. Traffic Safety Commission (January 10, 2017).

Communications:

2. Communication from Supervisor Evans re: That Brown County goes on record in retaining the current prison or finds a location for a new prison within Brown County. *Referred from April County Board.*
3. Communication from Supervisor Zima re: That the attached 3 requests be referred to the Public Safety Committee:
 - a. Request for the Clerk of Courts to provide a list of CM, CF, CT, TR cases from 2014-2017 without valid driver's license or State identification information listed.

- b. Request from the Brown County Sheriff for a list of all ICE deportations from the Brown County Jail from Jan. 1, 2014 to present.
- c. Request for the Brown County Sheriff to participate in a partnership with ICE which will give Sheriff Deputies the power to act as federal immigrant agents in the County Jail. The program, known as 287(g), is an agreement between ICE and law enforcement agencies that, after a four-week training program, grants state and local officers the power to question and detain immigrants deemed deportable in state and local jails. The agreement gives trained sheriffs' deputies the authority to use ICE databases, question inmates about their immigration status and place inmates with deportable immigration statuses on detainers for up to 48 hours after their scheduled release to allow time for ICE agents to pick them up for deportation. According to the ICE website, there are 37 law enforcement agencies across 16 states that have such a partnership with the agency. *Referred from April County Board.*

Resolutions and Ordinances

4. Resolution re: 2016 Balanced Budget Adjustment.

Clerk of Courts

5. Budget Status Financial Report for December 2016 (Preliminary and Unaudited).
6. Budget Status Financial Report for February 2017 (Unaudited).
7. Request for representation from the Clerk of Courts and Courts to attend each meeting monthly to provide monthly updates including various reports as requested by this committee. *Standing Item.*

District Attorney

8. IRS findings regarding Contract Attorney in the District Attorney's Office.
9. District Attorney's Report.

Public Safety Communications

10. Budget Status Financial Report for December 2016 (Preliminary and Unaudited).
11. Budget Status Financial Reports for January, February and March 2017 (Unaudited).
12. Director's Report.

Emergency Management

13. Budget Status Financial Report for December 2016 (Preliminary and Unaudited).
14. Budget Status Financial Reports for January, February and March 2017 (Unaudited).
15. Director's Report.

Medical Examiner

16. Budget Status Financial Report for February 2017 (Unaudited)
17. 2017 Medical Examiner Activity Spreadsheet.

Circuit Court, Commissioners, Probate

18. Budget Status Financial Report for January, February and March 2017 (Unaudited).

Sheriff

19. Budget Status Financial Report for February and March 2017 (Unaudited).
20. Budget Adjustment Request (17-22): Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount.
21. Budget Adjustment Request (17-24): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.
22. Budget Adjustment Request (17-25): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.
23. Budget Adjustment Request (17-26): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.
24. Budget Adjustment Request (17-34): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.

25. Resolution in Support of Legislation to Classify County Jailers as Protective Occupation Participants (POPs) for WRS Purposes. *Held for one month and Referred back from March County Board.*

Other

26. Audit of bills.
27. Such other matters as authorized by law.
28. Adjourn.

Patrick Buckley, Chair

Notice is hereby given that action by the Committee may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda.

Please take notice that it is possible additional members of the Board of Supervisors may attend this meeting, resulting in a majority or quorum of the Board of Supervisors. This may constitute a meeting of the Board of Supervisors for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to this agenda.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Public Safety Committee was held on Wednesday, March 1, 2017 at the Brown County Sheriff's Office, 2684 Development Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Buckley, Supervisor Clancy, Supervisor Evans, Supervisor Zima, Supervisor Nicholson
Also Present: Medical Examiner Director of Operations Barry Irmen, Emergency Management Director Jerad Preston, Public Safety Communications Director Cullen Peltier, Sheriff John Gossage, Human Services Director Erik Pritzl, GBPD Officer Barb Gerarden, GBPD Captain Todd Le Pine, Office Manager Holly Malvitz, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Technology Services Director August Neverman, District Attorney David Lasee, Judge Zuidmulder, news media, other interested parties

**Audio of this meeting is available by contacting the County Board office at 920-448-4015*

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Buckley at 11:00 am.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of February 1, 2017.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Comments from the Public. None.

1. Review minutes of:

- a. Consideration of Implementing an OWI Treatment Court (January 23, 2017).**

This item was held until the arrival of Judge Zuidmulder; no action taken.

- b. Public Safety Communications Advisory Board (July 27, 2016).**

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Communications

- 2. Communication from Supervisor Schadeewald re: This is my request for the committee to evaluate Montana Meth Project commercials for possible use as public service announcements in Brown County. Held for one month.**

Sheriff Gossage informed he is still waiting for updated information from the State on this.

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. **Communication from Supervisor Buckley re: Have Human Services break out contract with Family Services. Start an RFP process to update the EM-1/Alcohol Hold procedure. Also have staff evaluate to see if it would make fiscal and quality of care sense to bring services back in-house. Referred from February County Board.**

Human Services Director Erik Pritzl recalled that at the last meeting there were four specific areas the Committee wanted to hear more about. The first area was with regard to the current status of the contract with Family Services and what the contract includes and the dollar amount of the contract. The base contract for crisis services is \$855,046 and this has been in place for quite a while. There were funds added for mobile crisis expansion in 2016 to 2017 which brought the total for all crisis services to \$1,055,046. Pritzl feels it is important to note that the County does submit billings to the State of Wisconsin for crisis services. The average submitted to the State over the last five years is \$450,913 and the average received back from the State is \$221,798. Human Services receives logs from the Crisis Center monthly and submits them to the State on a monthly basis.

Supervisor Evans asked how long the contract is. Pritzl responded that it is an annual contract but he does not know when the contract was started. Jeff Vande Leest, CEO of Family Services, was in attendance and spoke to this subject. He said Family Services has been providing crisis services to the County since 1980 which was well before his time. He does not know if there was an RFP at that time. The mobile crisis expansion came in 2016 in the form of an addition to the contract and Pritzl noted that Family Services is the only crisis provider in the County.

Chair Buckley asked where the reimbursement received from the State goes. Pritzl said the majority of the dollars are retained by the County, but the contract says if there are out-of-county residents that receive a service from the Crisis Center, that the County passes it through to them for a non-Brown County resident. The State is billed per client, per unit of service and typically reimburses for about 49% of what is submitted and what is submitted is about 50% of what the cost is, so the County gets about 25% back. The contract covers the full array of services the Crisis Center provides including mobile services, lobby services, acute mental health services, parent/child services, etc. as well as emergency detention services. Pritzl said it would be difficult to say how much of the contract specifically supports the EM1 cases, but that is something they can work on in the future.

At this time the Committee skipped ahead to Item 4 to allow Judge Zuidmulder to speak so he could get back to the Courthouse.

Supervisor Zima asked how the amount the County bills the State is determined. Pritzl said is based on credential level of the provider. There is a set reimbursement rate based on the provider's degree. The County submits full charges but Pritzl said Medicaid reimbursement rates do not make the County whole. The County does submit the losses to the State through another process called WIMCR. All the losses are submitted and the State has a pool of money for all of the counties that gets divided up. Evans asked if Brown County charges other counties for providing services to their residents. Pritzl responded that the County is obligated to provide services to anyone within our boundaries from the first point of contact for 72 hours.

Pritzl continued that he has scheduled a meeting with internal contract and program managers to start looking at the RFP which was part of the original communication to try to arrive at what the emergency detention process is and what the general crisis and community type functions are to see if the contract can be separated into two different parts, one being the EM1 part and the other being the general crisis piece.

Evans asked Family Services to explain the functions of the Crisis Center because it is his understanding that the Crisis Center is going above and beyond what is in the contract. Vande Leest said that over the years the load has evolved and a lot of value add type services have developed and it is difficult to prioritize sometimes where they get the most bang for the buck for the services they provide.

Evans informed that law enforcement has an issue when they bring someone to the Crisis Center because they have to sit around and wait which prevents them from being out on the streets patrolling and asked Vande Leest for his thoughts on this. Vande Leest responded that this is all part of the process and is not necessarily a Crisis

Center issue as much as it is the process of doing an initial screening and then if there is a need for further referral there is a need for medical clearance and all of this becomes part of the equation. Each of these steps take time. From Vande Leest's perspective, where the system often gets bogged down is when someone goes through all of these steps and then there is no local capacity for placement and officers have to transport to Winnebago or Mendota. The EM1 process is long and involved and includes a lot of legal steps. Family Services is open to looking at whatever they can do to help streamline the process given the legal and statutory requirements.

Buckley asked if there would be a possibility of contracting with one of the local hospitals so the medical clearance and evaluation could be done right there. Pritzl said that is an option to look at during the RFP process. He feels some communities have probably gone in this direction and he also brought up the idea of using mobile crisis more effectively by getting them into the hospitals to alleviate the step of going back to the Crisis Center if the client is going to a facility. He feels there are efficiencies to gain in this respect and he will talk about this a little later. Pritzl also brought up the medical clearance issue and said that some progress is being made in that there is now a standard medical clearance. In the past, people would go through the process with the Crisis Center and be assessed and then they pick a facility which may have a different medical clearance standard than another facility. Now all of the facilities are agreeing that when a determination is made by the emergency department that it is a low risk situation, the people will be accepted without further testing. This is established and is being accepted now. The only wildcard in this is Winnebago because their medical clearance is so different. The County wants to avoid using Winnebago for that reason as well as the fact that it is out of Brown County.

Pritzl also talked about crisis staff access to the emergency rooms as this has been another contentious issue. He said he received the agreement back from Corporation Counsel and it is now in the hands of the HSHS system. Hopefully this will be finalized very soon so Crisis Center staff can get into the two HSHS hospitals.

Evans understands the problem in the system with all of the hoops and protocol but questioned what creating a new RFP would do to solve the problems. Buckley recalled that at the last meeting we talked about the time consuming process of having two officers tied up for an average of five hours per call which is costing a great deal of money for the law enforcement agencies every year. Some of the smaller agencies do not have the manpower on the road to sacrifice two officers sitting with a subject for a great deal of time. Buckley feels we need to take a look at what the contract with Family Services is right now and then look at how the procedures could be updated from when the contract started in the 1980s. There have been some updates with things like mobile crisis, but from a fiscal standpoint and a departmental staffing standpoint, we have to figure out a way to cut the officers' time on these calls. Buckley said law enforcements' job is to take care of the immediate threat and get the person to a facility to get the assistance they need. He said another thing to look at is for the County to use a transportation service to take the people where they need to be rather than tying up law enforcement time for hours upon hours. Another option may be a one stop shop type of model where someone could go to be evaluated, get medical clearance and then go to placement from there.

Zima said this subject has also been discussed at the Mental Health Ad Hoc Committee and he asked law enforcement in attendance to update this Committee on efforts being made.

Supervisor Nicholson arrived at 11:42 am.

GBPD Officer Barb Gerarden said EM1s in February went up. They had 42 EM1s, several of which were pretty complicated. Over 300 man hours and \$15,000 in officer time was spent in February although she noted this is a pretty conservative figure. Of the complicated calls, the least amount of time spent was five hours and the most amount of time was 32 hours. Buckley asked if those numbers include calls that did not result in detention. Gerarden responded that several of the people could have been safety planned at the hospital, but from the GBPD perspective, if they do the paperwork, they are deemed to be an EM1. Buckley asked Gerarden what they would like to see addressed from a law enforcement perspective. She responded that the one stop shop model being proposed makes perfect sense to reduce officer time and, more importantly, to get a patient to the help

they need quicker with less in custody time. Some of the cases in February resulted in use of force as a result of the patient being in custody so long. She feels anything that can be done to mainstream is better and good.

Gerarden continued that they are hopeful that the medical protocol Pritzl talked about earlier will reduce medical clearance time, but there is some concern that they will still require too many people to get cleared based on the language in the agreement. They will be working on tweaking that and expressing their concerns. Still a problem is that crisis staff is not allowed into all of the hospitals, so she is hopeful that once that is finalized it will help. Gerarden also noted there were a lot of overdoses in February. The other thing she mentioned is that the hospitals are supposed to call Crisis to mobile them out to have the assessment done but they are not doing that; they are having officers come and transport the person to crisis and then they end up being safety planned and law enforcement was mostly used as a taxi. The hospitals say they need the bed, but it is felt that the hospitals know ahead of time when someone will be discharged. Law enforcement has to work with the partners at the hospitals on this. Zima feels if the front line staff is not aware of the protocol, the managers need to do a better job. Gerarden said there are a lot of system issues because of how complicated the entire process is and they will continue to work through it. She noted again that they did have significant issues in February.

GBPD Captain Todd Le Pine also addressed the Committee. He said he was at this meeting last month and talked about three separate things that hold up law enforcement when it comes to EM1s. The first is capacity, the second is lack of voluntary options and the third is chronic offenders. They are trying to address the chronic offenders with the mental health officers and are trying to work with Crisis to deal with the people they deal with regularly. He said law enforcement deals with some of these people every single day, and if they are not dealing with them, it is because the person is in custody somewhere. Le Pine feels there has to be a quicker way to get these people help. When officers deal with the same person every day, it is not good for the community, the person or the officer.

Le Pine also talked about the lack of voluntary options and noted that Willow Creek opened on January 12. The grand opening was attended by 20 GBPD officers, including five Captains and the Chief. On that day, Le Pine thought there was going to be a solution to the emergency medical process, but to this day, Willow Creek has not accepted one emergency medical patient. He does not know what the holdup is, but it has been 49 days. In that period of time the GBPD has done 82 emergency detentions. Multiple times in these situations people have tried voluntary options but those options are not available. He spoke of a call recently that took 12 ½ hours of officer time for a subject who went to Willow Creek for help. During the assessment period the person wanted to leave but the people at the hospital did not want them to leave because they were a danger to themselves so the police were called. The police came and took the person to a different hospital for medical clearance and then ended up in a Brown County facility. In another call, someone presented to Willow Creek for voluntary treatment and since they do not accept EM1s the police were called and use of force was necessary. That call used five officer hours.

Le Pine continued that when Willow Creek opened GBPD thought they would not have to transport people to Winnebago anymore. Taking someone to Winnebago creates a nightmare scenario for officers due to the amount of time it takes, not to mention how the patient stays in the back of a police car for hours which is not helpful. Le Pine talked about another scenario where 32 hours of officer time was used. Some of the time was investigatory, but the majority of it was the police guarding the individual at the hospital and then transporting him to Winnebago. The person was transported back from Winnebago the next day by the County's transport service and taken to the jail.

Le Pine spoke next about the capacity issue and said that it has not been addressed at all. He does not know what the holdup is and feels that something needs to be done as soon as possible to get Willow Creek to start taking EM1s. Law enforcement is doing the best they can and the EM1s are not going to go away. There are a lot of people in the community struggling and when they get called to a situation, they are going to err on the side of caution. There are two officers assigned full time to mental health issues and they are trying to deal with the chronic people and be proactive in going out to people.

///

Zima asked Le Pine if he had any idea of the financial capacity of the people law enforcement deals with to pay for services. Le Pine does not know their financial capacity, but he knows what it costs the GBPD. Zima shared a story about someone who was taken to Willow Creek for help and during the admission process it was discovered that the person did not have insurance; the person was sent out the door within 15 minutes. Willow Creek is a big joke in Zima's opinion. He said when they came to town, they said they would take any mental health patients regardless of ability to pay. However, upon more questioning Zima found that Willow Creek will only take these people provided there is a bed allocated, but they only have a few beds allocated to pro bono cases. Zima said he agreed with Buckley's one stop shop idea, but at the same time feels we have to talk about beefing up our own operation. He said there are people in the community that need longer treatment and this is something we need to address. The County is spending millions of dollars a year sending people to Trempealeau and Winnebago and that money could better spent serving these people right here in Brown County.

Buckley said he and Pritzl attended the last Human Services meeting and Buckley put in a communication to look at the RFP process and also to look at a long term solution for the County. Zima feels this is urgent and would like to see a solution to these problems in a year or year and a half. He said the Mental Health Task Force is made up of really strong people and important players, but the foot dragging comes in from the Human Services Department.

Pritzl spoke about the delay at Willow Creek and said the holdup is currently at the Human Services Department because they are continuing to work through details on the court process that follows the detention before the contract can be completed. Financial terms have been agreed on. Pritzl said they are working to ensure that a parallel process exists with Willow Creek and Bellin and this has taken a little more time than was expected. Zima feels Bellin is also a joke and reiterated that the County needs to have their own facility to help people. Pritzl said the Department does most of the pro bono for the public and that is their function. In looking at the total bed count in Brown County, there should not be a shortage of beds; there are more than enough psychiatric beds to meet the needs. Pritzl said that once the contract is finalized, he is hopeful that the capacity can be met. He said when the County has approached Willow Creek in a few situations they have not had capacity because they are still scaling up their operations. He said we also have to look at non-Brown County residents and recognize that the County systems are going to be stressed by Willow Creek because they are going to draw in people from other areas voluntarily seeking services, but then the person can decide they do not want to do it after all and law enforcement then becomes involved. Once the procedures for court are in place, the contract will be completed. Pritzl does not want to use Winnebago unless there are medical necessities that the County cannot address.

Zima reiterated we need to beef up our own operations and feels that sending people to other facilities is undermining our own operations. He fears that if everyone is taken to other facilities, the County Executive will look to close the hospital. He also feels we can bill out to other Counties and he will bring this up again at the Mental Health Ad Hoc Committee. He wants to do something within our own County rather than dealing with all of the outside operators who are only interested in the bottom line. The main interest of the County needs to be solving the problems in the most efficient way possible. He wants to move in the direction of the County moving back to at least the number of beds we had in the past. He feels the one stop shop model could be right out at the mental health center if there was more capacity.

Gerarden spoke about a recent case where the client ended up being transferred to Winnebago and said that the person would have been much better served here where he had community support. Not only is taking someone to Winnebago a matter of law enforcement time, it is also a matter of what is best for the patient and being transferred there is often not what is best for them. She also talked about voluntary placements and noted that sometimes people start out as voluntary but then change their mind and then those proceed on to EM1 cases. Lastly, Gerarden said that the GBPD would be willing to do the transport for those EM1 cases that end up going to Court. The GBPD is willing to do what they can to expedite the process and be a bridge in the short term.

Vande Leest added that in addition to talking about long term solutions to a very serious problem in the community, the more immediate short term solution is a much stronger use of mobile crisis options. He feels if

///

they can get out into the community more some of the cases could be diverted. Vande Leest feels it is incumbent upon Family Services to keep marketing that service and keep working with the hospitals and law enforcement to increase the mobile opportunities. He said that only about 20% of face-to-face contacts are currently done by mobile crisis.

Buckley asked if the communication gets referred back to staff, if there is a way to facilitate conversations with law enforcement to get their issues out in meetings and have a report back at the next meeting. He feels this Committee is talking about long term and short term issues and he would like to focus on a few of the things and come back with an update. Pritzl said based on the communication, where his Department would start is looking at the contract and if there are separation of the pieces and RFPs. He said that the current EM1 Committee has about 30 members and he feels that a subgroup could be pulled together to look at the key elements of crisis services. Le Pine said that what is really needed is help with the capacity issue. The frustrations of Zima are the same as the officers feel. Le Pine said it is not like these situations only come up once or twice a year; they are happening more and more frequently.

Evans said Bellin has been a strong partner to the County for many years and they go out of their way to ensure that they work hand in hand with the County. He said there seems to be issues with processing EM1s and then with the capacity. He feels the capacity is always lumped into the problem of EM1 placements and said it will be interesting to see what Willow Creek provides. Evans also said he talked to Willow Creek in a Human Services meeting in the past and he had great trepidation as they portrayed to be a great community partner but they are a for profit organization and he does not think they are going to be the solution. Evans recalled when he was involved with building the nursing home and how upset the nursing homes were because they felt that it would take away their clients. Then they defined how the nursing home would be utilized and the problem was solved. The point Zima seems to be making is if we want to solve this problem, the County has to take the leadership. This could easily be done by having a one stop shop and adding on to the CTC. The problem is that the County would have to spend money on this and this is where politics becomes involved. Zima said that expanding the CTC would allow the County to take clients from other counties to earn some of the money back. Evans continued that if the EM1 Committee is really serious about solving these issues, they should come out with a statement to the County that doing something out at the CTC would help solve the problem. Evans does not have a problem spending money for the benefit of the people of Brown County.

Buckley asked for a motion to refer to staff to follow up on the processes and procedures and start the RFP process. Evans said he would rather see a plan developed and then make a determination of what we need in an RFP. He does not want to see an RFP go out because some of the people that would be involved in the RFP practice are being influenced.

Buckley said this is being done simultaneously already by breaking out the contract with Family Services to figure out what is needed to develop an RFP. Evans asked if the contract with Family Services is wrong. He said we have a contract that is in place until the end of 2017 and we are not dissolving that contract. He continued that a plan can be developed moving forward, but putting RFP in front of items makes him nervous, especially when there is only one provider. Evans would rather see a conglomerate of organizations and he would rather have a plan instead of starting the RFP process. Evans asked Vande Leest what was wrong with the contract. Vande Leest said he did not necessarily think there was anything wrong with the contract, but said it is not specific in terms of where the focus should be. What they are trying to figure out is where to get the biggest bang for the buck; especially around this particular issue.

Pritzl said in the past year when they had discussions with the Crisis Center they have found that they exist for this one particular function which is really important but then they also address all the other things and there is not a lot of focus and they are being pulled in a lot of different directions. Buckley said there may be a different model to look at. Evans appreciated Buckley bringing this forward but said he will not support anything that says we are going to the RFP process. He would support a motion to determine a plan for EM1 and alcohol procedures. He said if we develop a plan and then determine we have to go out for RFP, that is a whole other discussion. Pritzl noted the EM1 process is already established and developed. Zima said the Committee needs

///

to consider if they want to contract for everything or if it is important enough to control your own staff and know what you have and what you can depend on. He is not knocking the contract services, but he is talking about having our own place that is a one stop shop. He does not like constantly having to depend on the rules of other facilities.

Pritzl said he is hearing the feasibility of having crisis services located at the CTC. Zima would also like to see someone available to give medical clearance, but Pritzl said they will not have a physician on staff 24 hours a day to do medical clearance; they are not a medical facility to handle acute medical needs. Zima said that medical clearance is just a formality and mostly a waste of time. Pritzl feels what the Committee is describing is co-locating inpatient services with crisis services in one place and then if someone is low risk medical clearance they will come through the door. If they are moderate, they may need medical attention. Pritzl said there would also need to be conversations about creating space and separating the space from the inpatient unit. Buckley said that if there were an addition to the CTC, it is more of a time involved process and he wants to see some short term goals along with the longer term goals. Part of the reason he wants to look at the RFP process is because we need to look at the scope of what Family Services does. If we are looking for more of a one stop shop, it needs to be built into the procedures and the processes going forward. If the County is going to look at doing this ourselves or contracting with someone to provide those services, we need to look at an RFP. Evans said the RFP would come after a plan is developed.

Supervisor Clancy asked that when Human Services considers this, that they consider the most practical solution for the whole process. It does not need to be grandiose, but he would like to see the most practical solution to get the job done.

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to put on hold and refer to Human Services, Mental Health Ad Hoc Task Force and EM1 Committee and come back when ready with a recommendation. Vote taken. Ayes: Zima, Nicholson, Evans, Clancy Nay: Zima MOTION CARRIED 4 TO 1

OWI Treatment Court

4. Update on the Consideration of Implementing an OWI Treatment Court.

Judge Zuidmulder passed out information, a copy of which is attached. He said the committee has had good meetings and they are focusing on the fourth offenses. He said that one of the things that jumps out is the BAC levels of the repeat offenders. The handout shows the BAC levels for people arrested on fourth offenses and in 2016 46% of all people arrested on a fourth offense had a BAC in excess of .20. In 2015, 53% of all people arrested for fourth offense OWI were above .20. Judge Zuidmulder said there is a population in the community that clearly has alcohol abuse problems and these are the people that are getting fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh offenses. The fourth offense is a felony and includes a prison sentence. Since records are available for the first, second and third offenses they can look to see if there is a pattern. If the BAC in the previous offenses are .15 - .22, there is a high degree of probability that the person is an alcoholic and it appears that even if they are locked up, they will come back into the community and this will happen again which is a dramatic public safety issue.

Judge Zuidmulder continued that an OWI Court would be designed to focus on taking the fourth offenders and then order absolute sobriety. They would be on the SCRAM unit and support such as AA meetings would be ordered to try to create a setting to emphasize that the alcohol issue is life long and needs to be addressed in a positive way. They also do not want to militate against the jail sentence to reward the people for a .20. Judge Zuidmulder wanted to share this information with the Committee and let them know that the group is diligently working on this and it is anticipated that they will have a proposal in the future. Evans thinks this is great work and he wants to do whatever is possible to mitigate the problems, but asked if it would make more sense to have the OWI Court target third offenses to prevent them from getting to a fourth offense. He feels that once someone is at the fourth offense, it is a felony and there would be jail or prison time, whereas if they get to a third offense it may be an easier opportunity to change someone's life before they get to the fourth. Judge Zuidmulder explained that the fourth offense is a felony so the probation is longer. The other thing they are looking at is that there is a drop out level after each offense and part of what they are looking at is the natural

///

punitive system in place that the society buys into that does in fact get a certain percentage of people to stop. The numbers between the fourths, fifths and sixths are much more stable. There is a high probability that if someone gets to a fourth offense, they will go on to additional offenses because the current punitive system designed to get people to stop has not worked for them. In terms of looking at the resources and how to get the best bang for the buck, Judge Zuidmulder feels the number they are looking at is best. The Judge would also have the discretion to put someone other than a fourth time offender into the OWI Court, but the criterion would probably be a pattern of .20 or above. He noted that many of these people do pretty good in other areas of their lives, hold down jobs, etc., but just cannot get a handle on the alcohol.

Zima asked what is needed to get an OWI Court in place. Judge Zuidmulder said they would like to start out by taking 20 – 25 people and they would need SCRAM units, electronic monitoring, and would also have to look at an additional case manager to keep track of these people and make sure they are going to the programs and behaving themselves. When all of these costs are figured out, the committee will come back and explain everything and let them know how much they feel it would cost. He feels that if an OWI court is implemented, there would be participants to fill it in the first six months. Clancy asked if the model would include avoiding going to prison if they abide by the terms of the OWI Court. Judge Zuidmulder responded that it is likely that he would impose a sentence similar to what people get that are not in the OWI court, but stay the sentence, but order some conditional jail time so that there is a punishment component. There would also have to be firm lines on what the consequences would be for breaking the OWI Court rules. The main issue is public safety and it is absolutely not going to be designed to allow anyone with these issues to create a public safety issue. In fairness to the Public Safety Committee, the public and the participants, there need to be very clear lines so everyone knows exactly what the expectations are.

Evans appreciated the Judge's report and asked that the next time the OWI Court committee meets, that they take a hard look at making the Court available to third time offenders. Evans is in support of an OWI Court, but feels that preventative measures are better than reactive measures.

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

At this time the Committee returned to the discussion on Item 3.

2016 to 2017 Carryover Funds

5. Circuit Courts, Commissioners, Probate.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to take Items 5, 6 & 7 together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve Items 5, 6 & 7. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Emergency Management.

See action at Item 5 above.

7. Public Safety Communications.

See action at Item 5 above.

District Attorney

8. 2016 to 2017 Carryover Funds.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

///

9. **Budget carryover requests. *Held for one month.***

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Zima to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Medical Examiner

10. **Update on Brown, Door and Oconto Partnership.**

Medical Examiner Director of Operations Barry Irmen informed that the agreements with Door and Oconto counties have been finalized and they intend to start the new scheduling on March 14.

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

11. **2017 Medical Examiner Activity.**

Evans asked if Irmen had been contacted by WBAY regarding a story they are working on. Irmen responded that he has not been contacted personally, but he thought administration may have received a call. Evans suggested that Irmen may want to reach out to WBAY but Irmen responded that typically in counties where they have partnerships he prefers to keep a low profile as he does not want to speak for any of the partners they work with or the County or the County Board. Buckley agreed that depending on the angle of the story we want to be careful because of the situation they were brought into. Irmen assured that he talks to the media whenever they call regarding a case he is working on and he gives press releases when appropriate, but in this situation he feels it may go around the corner to what was here in 2015 and earlier and he would rather not get into that.

Motion made by Supervisor Clancy, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Sheriff

12. **2016 to 2017 Carryover Funds.**

Sheriff Gossage pointed out that the carryover document distributed in the agenda packet is not portrayed correctly. He said his Department submitted carryover funds of \$60,396 which included \$59,400 for the in squad cameras and said they purchased half the cameras in 2016 and half in 2017. The dollar amount shown on the document is \$60,396 which was approved by the County Executive, however, the County Executive came back to the Sheriff's Department on February 22, 2017 and told Chief Deputy Todd Delain that because the Department was only \$52,164.26 in the black, that they were not able to carryover \$60,000 to cover the cost of the cameras that were ordered. Gossage told the County Executive he had been a good steward to the County for five years and has returned \$1.7 million dollars to the general fund and the County Executive now says he is going to take \$8,000 out of the 2017 budget. Gossage pointed out that the County Board sets the budget and he does not feel it is appropriate to be sanctioned and for the County Executive to take \$8,000 out of the budget and further, it is not allocated in the document that was distributed to the Committee. The report was signed by the County Executive on February 17 and this was brought to Gossage's attention on February 22. Gossage said that in full transparency, it is really \$52,164.26 and he reiterated that in the last five years he has given \$1.7 million dollars back to the general fund and he feels that there were other departments that were in the black that could have covered these costs, as he did with the funds he returned to the general fund over the last five years.

Gossage continued that he is willing and able to invoice departments that owe money that he does not charge out for things like civil process fees. He also did not charge back the County for active shooter training taught by his officers in the amount of \$18,588. He is upset about this situation, especially since he is a good steward to the taxpayers and prudently budgets accurately and correctly and now is being called on the carpet for \$8,000 that he looks at as being a sanction for cameras that have already been ordered for the squad cars. He finds this incredulous. ///

Weininger said that no one is trying to make the Sheriff upset, but the rules for carryover requests is that at the end of the year the money has to be in the budget to carryover and this was the most that could be allowed to be carried forward. In addition, they actually went beyond that because there is a casual payout and administration included those extra dollars to cover it. The casual payout the Department is receiving is \$199,000 from that fund and the amount which would have originally been available was about \$147,000. Administration knew it was a needed expense and had to be done, but according to policy the most that can be carried over is the amount that is available. If there was a different way to do it, it would have been done differently, but moving forward they are roughly \$9,000 short. The options would be a resolution for general fund usage of \$9,000 or find the necessary funds by finding savings in the Sheriff's \$38 million dollar budget. A third option which would be a little trickier would be to take the money from the other departments that have carryovers and ask for a budget adjustment. Buckley asked if there is money available from another department and Weininger responded that they are still working on year end and that is why these are all estimates.

Gossage presented bills to Weininger for charge backs to administration. Gossage said he is transparent and the bills he presented to Weininger were for civil process of papers for Child Support and Corporation Counsel. He said that they do not charge those back to the County. Gossage continued that when the County Executive takes money out of his budget he always says not to worry because it's all one big pot of money. Gossage responded that if this is all one big pot of money, his \$9,000 should come out of the pot. He is sure that his \$1.7 million dollars that has been given to the general fund has been used to offset shortages in other departments in the past. He continued that the County Executive wants to run this like a business and Gossage will treat it like a business by sending invoices out to the departments since the books are not closed yet and anyone in the black can pay the bills.

Weininger said the money that is turned over at the end of the year goes to the general fund. The general fund is not typically used to offset operation costs. Weininger also said that there are no other options for the carryover requests. The amount of money in the budget is what can be carried over. Zima asked the Sheriff if he would have enough money if he charged back the other departments. Gossage said that the chargebacks he currently has amount to \$18,000. Gossage noted that he gets chargebacks from the other departments but Weininger said that those are set up as cost units. Gossage said that his department does not create revenue in the Sheriff's Department, but Weininger countered that the jail does raise revenue.

Weininger continued that the easiest way to do this would be to do a transfer between departments or do a general fund request. These are the two options to get the additional dollars. Gossage wanted it on record that this is why government fails. He is a good steward to the taxpayers and returned \$1.7 million to the general fund. Now he is \$52,000 to the good and he wants to carryover money that is already encumbered and he is sanctioned. He asked what incentive there is for department heads to meet their budgets. Zima said that the Sheriff is being too modest and noted that before he took over there were large shortfalls in the Sheriff's Department.

Weininger said that in 2016 there was an additional \$616,000 of levy added to the Sheriff's Department and in 2017 there was an additional \$890,000 added. With regard to the casual payout, the County Executive told Gossage his Chief Deputy agreed to it but that was another dishonest statement. The Chief Deputy was told this is what was going to happen and it came as a shock to the Sheriff because he had not been made aware of it. Gossage explained the department gets expensed for the casualty day payout and the funds are kept in the HR coffers, but it should be given back to each department. Weininger said the money is not in HR anymore. There are x amount of dollars set aside and if a department runs under budget and does not have enough money to cover the casual payout, the money is transferred to the department to cover the casual payout shortfall. Delain said the Sheriff's Department pays the bill for the casual payout and the money is put in an account. If the Department ends up in the black the money remains in the fund wherever it is and then it is used somewhere else.

Weininger said the issue is this: the Sheriff has an expense that he needs for his squad cars. They wanted to carry it out in 2016 but there was not enough time to do it in 2016 so they will have to do it in 2017. Usually the

///

Sheriff finishes the year to the good, but this year they did not finish to the good. Per policy, departments are only allowed to carry over the funds that they actually have so the Sheriff ends up short in the money he can carry over.

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to approve the carryover of the available funds and take remainder from the general fund. *Motion withdrawn; no vote taken.*

Weininger looked for ways to get around this, but there is no way. The purchase order for the cameras is a total purchase order for \$137,000 and it is for 2017, not 2016. There is not a possible journal entry for this. Gossage said that County policy will not allow the County to receive the product without paying for it. He budgeted for half the cameras in 2016 and half in 2017.

Weininger's recommendation would be a general fund resolution. He said that to use fund balance, a resolution is needed which would go through this Committee, Administration Committee and then on to the County Board. Gossage said he can try to find the savings in 2017, but he did not like the way he was told about this at the eleventh hour and then having a document submitted for the carryover which was inaccurate. Weininger said the 2016 books are not closed yet so the final numbers will not be known until the over/under report is done. Gossage asked how Weininger came up the number of \$8,000 if the books are not closed yet; he could have more revenue coming in.

Evans asked about the \$996 for the Citizens Academy. Gossage said that that amount is correct and the \$59,000 is also correct, but the accurate number he has left according to administration is \$52,164 so he would have to come up with the additional \$8,300 in 2017. The carryover request really is for the \$52,164.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to approve the carryover for the Citizens Academy supplies funded by donations in the amount of \$996. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to approve the carryover for in squad video systems in the amount of \$52,164. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to approve \$8,500 for in squad video systems to be taken out of the general fund. *No vote taken*

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Evans to refer this to administration to fund the remainder of up to \$8,500 to pay for the in squad cameras. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. Budget Adjustment Request (17-08): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.

This 2017 budget request is to increase federal grant revenue and related grant expenses to participate in a Homeland Security ALERT training grant that provides funding to attend the National Tactical Officers Association conference in September, 2017. The fiscal impact is an increase in revenue and offsetting expense of \$2000.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

14. Budget Adjustment Request (17-11): Any allocation from a department's fund balance.

This request is to increase federal asset forfeiture expenses to purchase items not originally included in the adopted 2017 budget utilizing the asset forfeiture fund balance carried over into 2017. These expenses have been approved by the Drug Task Force Oversight Board which has discretion over the expenses from the fund. Expenses consist of two DTF K-9 dogs and related training for \$25,000 and in-squad cameras for two DTF vehicles for \$11,966. No tax levy money is involved in this adjustment. The fiscal impact is \$36,966 non-levy dollars (utilize asset forfeiture fund balance). ///

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. Resolution in Support of Legislation to Classify County Jailers as Protective Occupation Participants (POPs) for WRS Purposes. *Held for one month.*

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. Sheriff's Report.

Gossage reported that he will be taking part in the CP Telethon this weekend.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Clerk of Courts – No agenda items.

Other

17. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to pay the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

18. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.

19. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to adjourn at 1:06 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

///

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING BOARD**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wisconsin Statutes, a regular meeting of the Brown County Criminal Justice Coordinating Board was held on January 26, 2017 at 8:00 am in the Truttman Room of the Brown County District Attorney's Office, 300 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Walsh, Sheriff John Gossage, Family Services Representative Angela Stueck, Jail Captain Larry Malcomson, Supervisor Brusky, TAD Grant/Treatment Court Coordinator Mark Vanden Hoogen, District Court Administrator Tom Schappa, District Attorney David Lasee, Supervisor Evans, Green Bay Police Chief Andrew Smith, Judge Zuidmulder, Division of Community Corrections Representative Michelle Timm

Excused: Citizen Rep Kathy Johnson, Citizen Rep Tim Mc Nulty, Human Services Director Erik Pritzl

1. Call Meeting to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Walsh at 8:02 am.

2. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by John Gossage, seconded by Joan Brusky to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. Approve/modify Minutes of December 8, 2016.

Motion made by Joan Brusky, seconded by David Lasee to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. Mental Health/Detox Beds (Erik Pritzl).

TAD Grant/Treatment Court Coordinator Mark Vanden Hoogen shared information on behalf of Human Services Director Erik Pritzl who was unable to attend the meeting. Bellin is currently providing detoxification services in Brown County and the County is also currently working on a contract with Willow Creek to provide detoxification services which should help address capacity issues. As of December 2016, there have been 17 detox admissions with an average length of stay of 1.76 days. There have also been six voluntary admissions and 11 holds. There were six referrals that were not admitted due to no shows, medical clearance issues or communication problems. GBPD noted there were three holds in December and all three went well.

GBPD Chief Andrew Smith noted that two officers have been selected to work fulltime on mental health issues which will hopefully lower the time officers spend on mental health calls. He noted that his department handled 695 EM1s last year at an average of five to six hours each. He is hopeful the two dedicated officers who have a talent for these cases and want to work them and know the system will be a game changer in reducing the amount of time the EM1s take. Smith explained the officers will have flexibility to work when the most EM1 calls come in which is typically mid-day. He said the perfect situation would be to have a County clinician paired with two police officers and also to double the number of mental health officers and he is hopeful that someday this will happen.

Supervisor Evans asked Smith to outline how a typical EM1 is handled. Smith explained that these calls typically come in as a radio call for a mental health crisis and noted that many of these people are "frequent flyers" that they see several times a week. Officers trained in this typically know the people, know who their relatives are and what connections they have and they take over the calls. The biggest problem is getting people admitted when it has been determined that they are a danger to themselves or others or when they are unable to care for themselves. Sometimes there is no space available, but the dedicated mental health officers are able to cut through the paperwork more quickly because they know the staff involved which typically makes things happen a little more

1a

quickly. With Willow Creek, the number of trips that will have to be made to Winnebago should be greatly reduced as well.

Judge Zuidmulder said the mental health officers have also been a tremendous asset to the Mental Health Court. They come to court every Friday and know the court participants. He noted that prior to being in the Mental Health Court, many of the participants had very frequent police contact. It is phenomenally impressive at how the police contacts are reduced after these people begin the program. Judge Zuidmulder noted these are typically people that the criminal justice system is poorly equipped to handle, and tangling them up in the criminal justice system is counterproductive. The mental health officers have additional credibility with the EM1 people and have a little extra push sometimes when it comes to having someone admitted. Smith added the mental health officers they have are two of the best and have a knack for it, wanted to do it and competed for the job.

Sheriff Gossage indicated he would like to see a model that would allow Human Services to transfer some of the longer term clients over to Willow Creek from the CTC to free up some beds for weekends. This would help save trips to Winnebago and Mendota when there are capacity issues at busy times.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by Joan Brusky to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **Jail Population Numbers (Larry Malcomson).**
 - a. **Detail on population by offense.**
 - b. **Drill down numbers.**

Jail Captain Larry Malcomson informed that the jail is currently at 95% capacity. The reports generated by the jail management software system include the probation report and the bonds only report. The information is currently in the system for the bond only report, but it is still being worked on by the software company. There are currently 105 people in the jail on probation holds only. Judge Zuidmulder explained that some of the probation holds could be released in 72 hours, some are there that may or may not be revoked and then there are some in the jail where a determination has already been made to revoke, but if the person does not agree, they are entitled to an administrative hearing and they are waiting for that.

Judge Zuidmulder brought up the idea of forming a subcommittee of this group with representation of the Department of Corrections, DA's Office and Sheriff's Department to meet every couple of weeks to go over patterns of the numbers of people falling into these categories and discuss if there is anything that can be coordinated to impact and reduce those numbers. Regarding the bond people, Judge Zuidmulder also suggested the DA's Office, Public Defender's Office, Court Commissioners and Judges meet to see who these people are, where they are and whether or not they want to look at the bonds. If it is determined there are people sitting in jail for six to eight months waiting for a trial, then the DA's Office or someone should have an explanation as to why the people are waiting that long. Sheriff Gossage said many times it is a longer time frame if they are waiting for a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. Judge Zuidmulder feels we need to get a better understanding of what that population is and if there are pieces of the population that we can do something about, he feels there is a responsibility to do something about it.

Sheriff Gossage said he recently looked at a case where someone had asked for a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge in October but the hearing has not been held yet. This is on the backs of the taxpayers and Gossage said that many times the Administrative Law Judges will release them on time served rather than sending them to prison. Michelle Timm said the time served ruling does not happen often.

1a

Judge Walsh feels data is needed so we can determine how long people are sitting in jail waiting for an Administrative Law Judge hearing. He does not object to forming a committee for this, but feels that the data is necessary. The discussion continued on who would be the most appropriate to gather the data. Judge Walsh also feels there needs to be a bonding tool that can be presented to the Judges and Court Commissioners to get buy-in so they use it. There also needs to be someone available to administer the tool questions. He noted that Judge Griesbach in Federal Court has someone employed by the courts that administers the tool and then does a risk assessment and provides the information to the Judge, but the Circuit Courts does not have a person in a similar position. Judge Zuidmulder asked if Judge Walsh, the Sheriff and himself can get together and meet with the County Executive to explain all of this so the County Executive can provide funds to employ someone to get the tool in place. He feels if we do not get a handle on this, the jail is going to be popping at 100% and the County is going to have to start spending money shipping people out of the County. He feels it would be more prudent to get money now for a position that can help prevent sending people to other counties.

Judge Walsh informed that the Day Report Center (DRC) does preliminary screenings and the plan is for DRC staff to have contact with everyone coming into the jail at a certain level and he feels that perhaps DRC staff may be able to do the assessment. Gossage added that they do the classification at the jail and the DRC is teaming up with them on that. Judge Zuidmulder said given the current jail population, this is the time to make the argument that in order to avoid shipping inmates out, we need to do something. Supervisor Evans said this Board should define what we want and what data we have and then from there we can say what we need and then from there it can go to the County Board.

Judge Walsh recalled a conversation on a different committee that they want to get to the point that the DRC is overtaxed to show there needs to be more funding for the program. Currently the DRC is going out to the jail every day and screening everyone that comes in. He said it may be a good idea to pick a tool and give it to the DRC to see if they are willing to administer it. If the DRC is not able to do it with the current staff they have then we would need to go back to the County Board and ask for more money. Judge Zuidmulder said the reality is that the jail is building back up to being full and we have not engaged on what might be a way to avoid that, so that is something that needs to be done rapidly.

Sheriff Gossage asked about the screening tool being used by the DA's Office for bonding purposes. DA Lasee said currently they ask four questions. Judge Walsh added there are several different tools and suggested getting together with the DA, Public Defender and some of the Judges and Court Commissions as well as someone from the jail and DRC to look at the tools and select one so it can be pitched to the Judges and Court Commissioners. Judge Zuidmulder would like to be proactive about getting something in place to address this.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by Judge Zuidmulder for Judge Walsh to put together a small task force to look at screening tools and report back. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Although shown in the proper format here, Items 8 & 9 were taken at this time.

6. **TAD Grant Programs: Case Manager new hire for Treatment Court (David Lasee).**

TAD Grant Coordinator Mark Vanden Hoogen said an offer will be made today to an individual for the Case Manager position. The candidate has a background of working at Options Treatment with the probation population as well as at ASPIRO and St. John's Homeless Shelter. Vanden Hoogen said the offer will be extended to the hands down best candidate there was who is very passionate and career driven. He is hopeful the candidate will accept the position and start in the next two weeks.

1a

Vanden Hoogen added that a webinar was recently held concerning the TAD grant and it basically covered some changes in the reporting as far as match funds is concerned.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by Joan Brusky to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Day Report Center (David Lasee).

Angela Stueck of Family Services reported on the Day Report Center. Things are going well and there have been about 50 people referred to date since they opened in November. They have completed 43 intakes and Stueck explained that the process includes sitting down with the individual and looking into their complete background and doing a mini evaluation/assessment and then making a recommendations back to the court as far as what the DRC feels they should be doing. This includes the frequency of their visits. Some participants come daily while others come in several times a week. The DRC also looks into what type of case management services are required and this is based on the intensity level that they bring as far as their background and current needs. Stueck also said they have a number of educational and evidence-based groups including anger/aggression, AODA, parenting and life skills. There are currently 55 people participating in the groups and that number is higher than the number of participants because some people are in more than one group to help occupy their time and keep them structured. Stueck believes there are at least three or four participants who are on treatment court waiting lists and she also indicated there have been two accepted into the treatment courts.

Evans asked if there were any capacity issues with the DRC. Stueck responded that they originally felt they could serve 75 – 100 people comfortably but since they have added the jail screening process it is taking a little more time and they continue to navigate through to see if that system is helpful in the process. She also said the classification process has been fantastic in getting the DRC what they need and helping them identify who they want to quick screen every morning and they are able to get that information back to the DA's Office and Court Commissioners for afternoon court sessions. Only a small handful of the people they have screened have made their way to the DRC and they are still trying to work out some kinks. The quick screen only takes about 10 minutes and they are looking at the information provided by classification. They also ask a few questions as to their level of needs and if they will participate with the DRC. Stueck said there have been some really belligerent responses and they advise the Court of this, but ironically some of these people have ended up at the DRC and are actually doing well. Judge Walsh wanted to be sure that DRC realizes the Judges are open to feedback and she said they continue to find their way and work through things to find how to be the most impactful. Stueck said the screening process takes a lot of time and noted they did the same process in Winnebago County but said they did not do as much hands-on programming there as they are targeting to do here. They find that hands down what is coming to them are very significant AODA issues and in some cases they cannot even meet all of the needs. In those situations they hook the people up with other community resources.

Stueck continued that they are continuing to work through all of the kinks to make the program as effective as possible. Lasee said if it is shown that the program works, we should look at putting someone at the DRC instead of being put on probation, but this is a bigger budget issue. This would be something to look at in the long term. If the person is successful at the DRC, probation may be avoided altogether for some of the low level offenders.

Evans asked who makes the determination as to how long someone goes to the DRC and Stueck responded that DRC staff makes recommendations back to the Court on this. Brusky asked about the staffing at the DRC and Stueck said they currently have full-time staff members as well as a vacant half time position that they are holding until they see the future needs to be sure it is targeted effectively. Hours at the DRC are 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, but it was noted that there is some flexibility in those hours when needed.

1a

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by Joan Brusky to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Mental Health Court (Judge Zuidmulder).

Judge Zuidmulder informed there are currently 13 – 17 participants in the Mental Health Court and the people involved are doing quite well. There is a waiting list and he is hopeful that with a new case worker the numbers can be pushed up to 25 – 30.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by John Gossage to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. OWI Court: Referral from County Board.

Judge Zuidmulder distributed a copy of the minutes taken at a meeting held on January 23, 2017 to discuss the formation of an OWI Court, a copy of which is attached. The meeting was very productive. He noted that the public education piece is having an impact because there has been a drop in first offense OWIs, however, the scary thing is how little movement there seems to be on the second, third, fourth and above offenses. They talked about this and will be looking at different models, but what they are thinking is looking at a BAC of above .20 for third to sixth offenses. He noted that as of January 1, 2017 all fourths, fifths and sixths are felonies and noted that the seventh and above carry a mandatory three years of initial confinement. Judge Zuidmulder continued that the first thing the group wants to do is see how many people fall into the category of .20 or above for fourth, fifth and sixth offenses to see if an OWI Court will have capacity for the number of people who fall into this category. From there they will look at other criteria such as how many people would qualify and if the people are willing to do it and they would also want to be sure that there is a sufficient number for a Court and then design criteria to fit that. He feels 20 – 25 people would be a good target. Judge Zuidmulder said an OWI Court in Brown County would replicate successful programs elsewhere and noted that participants would be on probation and would be supervised by a probation agent and a case manager. He has had some conversations with Sheriff Gossage and informed him that the Court would have to be equipped with sober links so participants can be monitored 24 hours a day. A budget also needs to be put together to include the cost of equipment like GPS units and sober links, case managers and treatment services and this would then be put into a proposal to come back to this group and then on to the County Board for consideration. He is very optimistic that this is going well and the only issue he feels there may be is recruiting another Judge to do this. There are already four judges involved in treatment courts so they would have to persuade another judge to do the OWI Court. Judge Zuidmulder feels those of us who have lived here all our lives know this is an area that we really have to take some action on. He said that statistically there is a high rate of accidents and deaths that are alcohol related and he feels that an OWI Court is something we need to do to help this out. He will continue to work on this with the committee that has been formed and would like to add someone from corrections to the group. Judge Zuidmulder would also like to get some scholarship money for the alcohol assessments because often people are not able to come up with the money for an assessment.

Judge Walsh indicated this matter was referred to this Committee by the County Board and asked if Judge Zuidmulder would be the designee of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board to address the Public Safety Committee. Judge Zuidmulder said he will keep the Public Safety Committee updated and also asked that the minutes he passed out at this meeting be forwarded to the Public Safety Committee.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by Joan Brusky that the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board is in support of the formation of an OWI Court with recommendations to follow. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1a

10. **Heroin/Drug Court (Judge Walsh).**

Judge Walsh reported that the Heroin/Drug Courts are doing well. There is currently a waiting list but the people on that list are using the services at the DRC until they can get into the treatment court.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by Joan Brusky to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. **Future agenda items, if any.**

Sheriff Gossage informed that the National Institution of Corrections will be conducting jail and justice system assessments in March. He feels the findings will be interesting to this Board and this is something that can be addressed in greater detail at an upcoming meeting.

Green Bay Police Chief Andrew Smith would like to see a discussion on the next agenda regarding the changes on immigration under the new federal administration.

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by David Lasee to place discussion regarding changes with regard to immigration under the new federal administration on the next agenda. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. **Such other matter as authorized by law. None.**

13. **Adjourn.**

Motion made by Pat Evans, seconded by David Lasee to adjourn at 8:59 am. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

1a

Minutes from Meeting on January 23, 2017

Consideration of Implementing an OWI Treatment Court

Present: Judge Zuidmulder, District Attorney Lasee, Sheriff Gossage, Capt. Knoebel, Attorney Enli, Attorney Viel, Mark Vandenhoogen, Lori White, Barbara Jordan, Adam Busalacchi.

1. List of OWI Treatment Court Committee Members and contact information distributed to members.

- a. Representative from Department of Corrections is needed on the Committee. Judge Zuidmulder will find out who the representative will be and add to Committee.

2. Discussion:

- a. OWI data from Clerk of Courts Office distributed to all members.
- b. Discussion as to different models and the requirements needing to be met to determine which individuals may be accepted into this treatment court. Mark V. asked to find out how long the OWI treatment courts in other counties have been in existence and the eligibility requirements.

Discussion as to the population of individuals that may be eligible for this treatment court: what number of offense for individual, time period between each offense, alcohol based offenses and high blood alcohol levels.

Consider other strategies for a broader approach for individuals that may not meet the eligibility requirements.

- c. Mark V. and Lori W. to request handbooks from other counties and to look at fiscal issues to be considered such as case manager position, monetary assistance for individuals to obtain assessments, cost of Soberlink monitors.

Sheriff Gossage can provide information on Soberlink monitors.


Judge Zuidmulder will request the Department of Corrections representative obtain a copy of the memorandum of understanding used in other OWI treatment courts and bring to next meeting.

District Attorney Lasee to review 4th offense cases from 2016, for blood alcohol levels of .20 or higher.

Next meeting: Monday, February 20, 2017, at Noon in Room 280, Branch 1 Jury Room.

OWI Convictions Brown County

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
OWI 1	171	235	296	324	277	327	240
OWI 2	358	303	289	277	278	265	236
OWI 3	162	200	169	189	155	183	178
OWI 4	86	69	95	87	89	78	81
OWI 5+	73	52	65	74	69	61	44
Total	850	859	914	951	868	914	779



Statute # 346.63(1)(a)

OWI Treatment Court Committee Email List

Judge Donald R. Zuidmulder	Donald.Zuidmulder@wicourts.gov
Supervisor Nicholson	<u>Vote4Nicholson@aol.com</u> or 465-3564
Sheriff John Gossage	<u>Gossage_JR@co.brown.wi.us</u>
Capt. Keith Knoebel	Keithkn@greenbaywi.gov
Lori White	White_LJ@co.brown.wi.us
Mark Vandenhooogen	VandenHoogen_MR@co.brown.wi.us
Barbara Jordan	Jordan_BA@co.brown.wi.us
Eric Enli	Eric.Enli@da.wi.gov
Jeff Cano	CanoJ@opd.wi.gov
Angela Stueck	Astueck@familyservicesnew.org
Adam Busalacchi	Adam.Busalacchi@dot.wi.gov
Lt. John Mitchell	<u>Mitchell_jw@co.brown.wi.us</u>
DOC Representative	Unknown at this time

12

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING BOARD**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wisconsin Statutes, a regular meeting of the Brown County Criminal Justice Coordinating Board was held on March 23, 2017 at 8:00 am in the Truttman Room of the Brown County District Attorney's Office, 300 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Judge Walsh, Citizen Representative Tim McNulty, Treatment Court Supervisor Mark Vanden Hoogen, County Executive Troy Streckenbach, Green Bay Police Officer Todd Le Pine, District Attorney David Lasee, County Board Representative Joan Brusky, District Court Administrator Tom Schappa, Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest, Green Bay Police Commander Jim Runge, Probation and Parole Representative Jennifer Hornacek

Excused: Sheriff John Gossage, County Board Representative Pat Evans, Jail Captain Larry Malcomson, Citizen Representative Bob Srenaski, Green Bay Chief of Police Andrew Smith, Human Services Director Erik Pritzl

1. Call Meeting to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Walsh at 8:00 am.

2. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Joan Brusky, seconded by Troy Streckenbach to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. Approve/modify Minutes of January 26, 2017.

Motion made by Joan Brusky, seconded by David Lasee to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. Mental Health/Detox Beds Progress (Erik Pritzl).

Human Services Director Erik Pritzl was excused from this meeting and therefore no report was given.

5. Jail Population Numbers (Larry Malcomson).

County Executive Troy Streckenbach informed the jail is currently at 91% percent capacity and, in addition, 40 inmates are being shipped out on a daily basis. Judge Walsh said one of the things being worked on is some sort of screening tool to help clear people who are awaiting trial out of the jail when appropriate. They are looking for a tool to assess people when they come into the jail and then have the data provided to the Judges and Court Commissioners to be used in determining bail. There is a meeting scheduled on this subject at the end of the month and Judge Walsh will keep this group updated of progress.

6. TAD Grant Programs: Case Manager new hire for Treatment Court (David Lasee).

Treatment Court Supervisor Mark Vanden Hoogen reported that Allyson Heiser has been hired as the case manager for Heroin Court. This is allowing for an increase in the numbers in the other treatment courts because now each court has their own case manager and they are able to meet the needs of the court participants to a higher degree. Vanden Hoogen said Heiser has a wide range of background that fits the treatment court population very well.

Judge Walsh also informed that a meeting was recently held regarding the possibility of getting STEP Industries to come into the community to set up a facility. Vanden Hoogen explained that STEP Industries currently has a site in Milwaukee and one in Neenah. They recently contacted Brown County to see if there was interest to have a facility

1a

here. STEP Industries gets manufacturing contracts from different organizations and produces them in-house. The primary focus is that they work with recovering addicts. They provide a great resource by providing jobs to people who typically have a difficult time finding a job. They also focus on recovery and there are breaks in the day to help employees work on different facets of recovery and there is also a housing component. Vanden Hoogen said a group will be meeting with ASPIRO and Curative to be sure that there would not be competition that would be a hindrance. District Attorney David Lasee said this is a neat idea and would be a good opportunity. STEP is considered a shelter workshop, similar to ASPIRO and Curative, but the population that works with STEP is a bit different and could potentially do a higher level of work because they do not have the same type of limitations that the other shelter workshops focus on. STEP focuses on short-term employment and provides participants with resources and services to help get them to more profitable employment in the future. It is more of a transitioning program than a long-term job. They teach them skills such as how to get to work on time, what to wear and how to act appropriately in the work place. Lasee feels there is a high need for placing people, especially those in the treatment courts as placing these individuals in meaningful work that leads to long-term stability is somewhat challenging.

Judge Walsh said both he and Judge Hammer feel graduates come out of the treatment courts having been clean and sober throughout the program but then have difficulty finding a job with a living wage. These people then affiliate with others to share rent and things of that nature and often times those are poor influences and the people end up falling back into bad patterns. The STEP program seems to be a very supportive environment and Vanden Hoogen added that STEP is very willing to be flexible with the participants to meet their needs.

Judge Walsh added they want to be sure that there is not a lot of crossover with STEP and what Curative and ASPIRO do and said there is also a question as to how much work there would be to farm out to a program like this. Streckenbach said manufacturers are desperately trying to find able bodies who want to work and change their lives for the better.

7. **Day Report Center (Judge Walsh).**

Streckenbach informed that numbers at the day report center are steadily increasing. There have been some discussions about having more meetings with the Judges to have a better understanding of what the day report center can do. Lasee added that there are still some communication barriers which affect work flow and they continue to work on that. Judge Walsh said he gets frustrated because he schedules meetings, but then people do not show up for the meetings. Lasee added that he has heard people are showing up at the day report center, but the day report center does not have a referral form. He has also heard concerns of the Clerk of Courts and Judges that they are not getting all the information on the violation reports consistently. Lasee said work is continuing on these issues. Judge Walsh said he has advised the day report center to let him know if there are any problems with the Court, but he has not heard from them. He also mentioned that the agreement was that the day report center would be assessing everyone who came into the jail for certain offenses so that no one would arrive in Court without being assessed at the jail. Lasee said they need to make it clear that it is not really an assessment; it is just a quick screening.

Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest said from his perspective, there needs to be more consistent communication. Some weeks things seem to flow smoothly and go correctly, but other weeks that is not the case. There seems to be a disconnect somewhere and he feels that following the processes and getting the right forms to the Clerk of Courts will help.

Streckenbach said this is a recurring theme and he has heard the same issues in some other meetings and asked what needs to happen to get a meeting with everyone involved in this process. Lasee said he does not want to sound overly negative because the program is doing a good job and there are people benefiting from the program, but there

1a

are some procedures that need to be cleaned up. Judge Walsh said a meeting should include the judges, public defenders, court commissioners and prosecutors as well as day report center staff. He feels it would be useful for Streckenbach to lend his name to a request to bring everyone together. Streckenbach said that for the investment made by the County in this, he has not heard a lot of positive things about the program, but he does feel it shows a lot of merit and there are just some bugs that need to be worked out. Judge Walsh assured that there are a lot of positive things the program is doing and will try to get a meeting set up to work on some of the issues in the next few weeks. Lasee said we are asking the day report center to do a lot, and it would work better if they could do more, but that is not possible on the budget the County has for the program.

Judge Walsh talked about the screening tool they are trying to set up for overall bail issues and noted that someone would need to assess the people. This would be something more comprehensive than the screenings that are currently being done which are basically to determine if someone is appropriate for the day report center program, but not anything comprehensive the Court would use to set bail. He has talked to the day report center about utilizing whatever tool is selected and the day report center said they would be open to it, but there needs to be an understanding that it will take up a lot more of their time. The tool would be utilized more for the purpose of determining bond than it would for determining who is appropriate for the day report center. Judge Walsh said although the day report center may be willing to do it, they probably do not have the staff to do it.

Lasee feels this is part of a larger conversation of substantially beefing up front end services which is what is going on at the State level. Evidence based practices are doing a lot more pretrial than Brown County does. All of the evidence based counties that are part of the grant initiative have substantially beefed up pretrial services. The notion is to get people assessed on the front end rather than having several different agencies assess them in different ways throughout the process. There should be more consistency on the front end so that when someone comes into the system they are assessed right away so they can get into programs without waiting. Targeting people on the front end would hopefully result in a resource savings later because the people that can be weeded out will be weeded out with low level interventions and the higher risk, higher needs population can be dealt with in a different way throughout the system, all by identifying this on the front end. Under the current model people are not getting a full scale evaluation until they are convicted and sent to probation and parole and Lasee feels this is why Brown County puts more people on probation per capita than any other county. He feels part of this is that there is not a lot of information available to the Judges when people are sentenced so the default seems to be to go to probation to get the services and treatment they need. A comprehensive screen on the front end and having some of the needs met prior to adjudication would allow the Judge to make an informed decision that may not involve probation or jail and may save resources on the back end.

Judge Walsh said it is important to remember not to mix up the conversation because day report was not designed for assessing people to determine what type of bail should be set. On the other hand, the Judges have been talking with the day report center about doing just that and the day report center said they do not necessarily have the resources to do that. Day report centers in other counties operate very similar to ours and he noted that the day report center here is doing a very competent job of managing people out of the jail while they are waiting to getting into the treatment courts and the waiting lists have been knocked down.

8. **Mental Health Court (Judge Zuidmulder).**

Judge Zuidmulder was not at the meeting and therefore no report was given.

9. **OWI Court (Judge Zuidmulder).**

Lasee indicated they have identified the population they want to try to address with an OWI Court and it would be repeat offenders with their fourth offenses and high blood alcohol concentrations of .2 and above. There are about

10

30 – 40 people who would fall into this category every year. Vanden Hoogen is in the process of putting together a handbook outlining the costs of this and the OWI Treatment Court Committee will be meeting soon to go over it and he will keep this Board updated.

Vanden Hoogen said that there are currently 13 active participants in Mental Health Court, 4 are waiting to be accepted and there are 3 on the referral list. Heroin court currently has 22 participants in the court along with 2 waiting to be sentenced and 2 on the referral list. Veterans Court currently has 26 people and Drug Court has 22 participants with 2 on the referral list. The numbers are increasing and things are headed in the right direction.

10. **Heroin/Drug Court (Judge Walsh).**

Judge Walsh did not have anything to add other than the numbers Vanden Hoogen referred to above.

11. **Future agenda items, if any.**

Vander Leest informed that he has submitted a request to NEWEye to have a PSA put together on the effects of OWI convictions and he will keep this Board advised of the progress.

Lasee would also like Judge Walsh to ask the Sheriff to report on the National Institute of Corrections visit to the jail.

12. **Such other matter as authorized by law. None.**

The next meeting date was discussed and May 11 at 8:00 am was selected.

13. **Adjourn.**

Motion made by Joan Brusky, seconded by Dave Lasee to adjourn at 8:40 am. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

1a

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY FIRE INVESTIGATION TASK FORCE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

A meeting of the Board of Directors of the Brown County Fire Investigation Task Force was held on December 8, 2016, at 9:00 a.m., at the Brown County Sheriff's Office, 2684 Development Drive, Green Bay, WI.

Present: Brandon Dhuey, Todd Delain, Alan Matzke, Ed Janke, Eric Dunning, Glenn Deviley, David Lasee, David Poteat

Item #1. Adoption of the Agenda.

Motion was made by Delain and seconded by Dunning to adopt the agenda. **Motion carried.**

Item #2. Review Minutes of Previous Meeting.

Motion was made by Delain and seconded by Deviley to approve the minutes from the last meeting on September 7, 2016. **Motion carried.**

Item #3. Report of General Membership Coordinator.

Dhuey reported there have been two arsons since the last meeting and that 25 percent of the calls this year have been arson. He reported five calls since the last meeting as follows:

990 Aldrin St., De Pere
2656 Oak Park Dr., Bellevue
4198 N. Overland Rd., Hobart
2102 Glendale Ave., Howard (arson/suspect arrested)
1 Duquaine Ct., Bellevue (arson)

Dhuey noted that there have been three arsons in the Bellevue trailer park this year.

Dhuey stated that Karl Linsmeier has resigned as an investigator on the Task Force but wants to remain on as an intern. He stated that investigator Al Snover and intern Rob Gering have also resigned from the Task Force. There was discussion on those who are not meeting Task Force requirements. Bill Tews and Ben Hermans are involved at fire investigation scenes through their department; however, it does not show on record with the Task Force. Matzke will check with Doug Peters as to his status on the Task Force. Dunning will talk to Chief Beiderwieden about Steve Yedica's status on the Task Force.

There are now four investigator openings. It was noted that Jim Weeks has his FIT certification. Greg Dougherty might also qualify. Dhuey will send out applications for interns/investigators. Then, a special meeting will be held in January to review and make selections. Matzke will talk to Green Bay and Bellevue fire chiefs about any potential interest from their departments.

Dhuey inquired about eliminating the photo log. He noted that the State Fire Marshal no longer uses a photo log—they now videotape a scene and then take photos. There was discussion about this, and Delain advised to continue with the photo log at this time until further discussion.

Dhuey stated he is buying safety vests, which will be kept in the arson rig. He also stated that due to problems with conference dues and registration, each member will pay on his/her own or through his/her department, then send an invoice to Barb Peters for reimbursement. Dhuey will email the chiefs about this new procedure.

Item #5. Financial Report.

Delain reported there is a balance of \$14,294.10 in the Task Force budget; however, November expenses have not been deducted from this. Motion made by Dunning and seconded by Matzke to approve the financial report. **Motion carried.**

Item #6. Old Business.

A. Disposition of Case Proceedings.

No new case dispositions to report per Lasee.

Item #7. New Business.

Janke stated his tenure with MABAS ends in January, so he will no longer be on the Task Force Board of Directors. A new chairperson will need to be elected at the next meeting. He stated he has been involved with the Task Force since 1997. He states he is going to put together a fire investigation task force in Oconto County.

Item #8. Report of Juvenile Firesetter Program Coordinator.

No report.

Item #9. Other Matters.

Delain stated the Drug Task Force seized a Ford F-250 truck with a diesel engine which might work for the safety house. The Task Force, however, may need to buy it from DTF. He will check into this.

FITF Board of Directors
December 8, 2016
Page 3 of 3

Item #10. Set Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting.

The next meeting was set for March 9, 2017, at 9:00 a.m., at the Brown County Sheriff's Office, 2684 Development Drive, Green Bay, WI.

Item #11. Adjourn.

Motion was made by Dunning and seconded by Delain to adjourn the meeting. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Marsha Laurent
Recording Secretary

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY FIRE INVESTIGATION TASK FORCE

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP

A meeting of the General Membership of the Brown County Fire Investigation Task Force was held on December 1, 2016, at 7:00 p.m., at the Brown County Sheriff's Office, 2684 Development Drive, Green Bay, WI.

Present: Greg Dougherty, Joe Gabe, Karl Linsmeier, Aaron Anderson, Kevin Tielens, Ron VanDenBusch, Craig Pakkala, Angie Cali, Matthew Omdahl, Greg Steenbock, Kim Ward, Kevin Krueger, Tom Hendricks, Karl Tielens, Terry Rottier, Joe Patenaude, Brandon Dhuey, Steve Zich, Douglas Dow

Item #1. Adoption of Agenda.

Motion was made by Anderson and seconded by Gabe to adopt the agenda. **Motion carried.**

Item #2. Review Minutes of Previous Meeting.

Motion was made by Dougherty and seconded by Hendricks to approve the minutes from the previous meeting on September 8, 2016. **Motion carried.**

Item #3. Report of Task Force Activities.

The Fire Investigation Task Force was called out to the following fires since the last meeting:

1. 990 Aldrin St., De Pere (9-16-16) (duplex/accidental)
2. 2656 Oak Park Dr., Bellevue (9-29-16) (garage/accidental)
3. 4198 N. Overland Rd., Hobart (10-4-16) (house/accidental)
4. 2102 Glendale Ave., Howard (10-11-16) (business shed/arson)
5. 1 Duquaine Ct., Bellevue (10-19-16) (recycle bin/mobile home/arson)

Item #4. Information from Board of Directors Meeting.

The next meeting is December 8, 2016.

Item #5. Old Business.

1. Fall conference review.

Members who attended the fall conference gave an overview.

Item #6. New Business.

1. Conference, dues, etc.

Barb Peters will no longer directly take care of payment for conferences and membership dues. You will have to go through your own department and then send an invoice to Barb for reimbursement. Barb will still take care of BCSO employees, though.

2. On-scene photographs.

Investigators need to do a better job in taking more photos at fire scenes.

3. Release of reports.

Normal procedure is that the report goes to the coordinator to disseminate to the appropriate agency. If it's a criminal case, the report will not be released to the agency until charges have been filed.

4. Interviews/interrogations at the Sheriff's Office.

Everyone will now have access to recording interviews at the Sheriff's Office.

5. Dictation for report.

Unless a case is criminal, interviews will no longer be transcribed, but do save it as an audio file on computer.

Item #7. Juvenile Firesetter Business.

Gabe stated that Cody Johnson from Green Bay Fire is going to national juvenile firesetter training next week.

Item #8. Other Business.

No other business was discussed.

Item #9. Set Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting.

General Membership meetings for 2017 were set as follows:

- March 2, 2017
Suamico Fire #2
2323 Northwood Rd.
- June 1, 2017
De Pere Fire #1
400 Lewis St.
- September 7, 2017
Ashwaubenon Fire #1
2155 Holmgren Way
- December 7, 2017
Brown County Sheriff's Office
2684 Development Dr.

Item #10. Training.

Training on photography followed the business portion of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Marsha Laurent
Recording Secretary

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEE – LEPC**

Pursuant to Section 19.84, Wis, Stats. A meeting of the **Brown County Local Emergency Planning Committee** was held on Tuesday, March 14th, 2017 @ 13:30 at Brown County EOC.

PRESENT: Lauri Maki, Jerad Preston, Chris Lehner, Dennis Carr, Russ Phillips, Bob Mayer, Adam Butry, Rachel Bessette, Kent Caelwaerts, Justin Hewitt, Mike Schoen, Steve Johnson, Leon Engler, Jeremy Klingbiel, Randy Tews

- **CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Jerad Preston at 13:30.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Approved by Russ Phillips, 2nd by Chris Lehner

- **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Approved by Leon Engler, 2nd by Mike Schoen

- **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

- A. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

- Talked about having members think about committees and which ones they would like to join/etc.

- B. **PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (PIE) COMMITTEE**

- No Report

- C. **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

- No Report

- **OTHER REPORTS:**

- A. **ARES/RACES UPDATE**

- New skywarn coordinator
 - Spotter training April 27
 - 4 severe weather activations last year, will still respond to EOC during severe weather
 - Lehner recently retired from MARS
 - ARES looking at recruiting
 - Looking at their message handling & operations
 - Spoke with Steve Johnson about possible relationships for funding between ARES and Health

1d

B. RECENT SPILLS

- January 12, Champeau/Tower Rd, NF, Diesel Fuel, UNK
- January 20, 1230 Shawano Av, GB, Transformer Fluid, 20 Gal
- January 23, 3399 Southridge Rd, DP, Wastewater, UNK
- January 30, 1/10 S of 2363 CTH J, SU, UNK, UNK
- February 16, Champeau/Tower Rd, NF, Diesel, UNK
- February 18, 41 South, N of CTH B, SU, Gas, 10 Gal
- February 28, Elgin St/Badgerland Dr, Wastewater, UNK
- February 28, 2099 Badgerland, HW, Wastewater, 3300 Gal
- March 3, 1575 Lineville Rd, HW, Wastewater, UNK
- March 3, 2480 University, GB, Various Fluids, UNK
- March 14, Kroll Farm, Humboldt, Manure, 1000 Gal

C. PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

- No Report

D. EM REPORT

- Airport Exercise Aug 16, 2017 - Looking for approx. 100-150 volunteers
- Severe weather awareness expo @Bay Park Mall Apr 23.
- Dark Sky EOC activation in 2018 (full activation)
- CodeRed and possible usages

• PUBLIC COMMENT

- No public comment.

• LEPC ROUND TABLE:

- Mike Schoen
 - Butadiene spill .163 gallons (.8 lbs)
 - Design of isolation piping system and knowledgeable workers prevented larger spill
- Russ Phillips
 - expanding ammonia system June 1 by adding 13 refrigerators.
- Chris Lehner
 - interest from ARES/RACES for severe weather expo
- Dennis Carr
 - Looking for a used flammable liquid cabinet
 - interested in airport exercise
- Jeremy Klingbiel
 - Halfway through their \$160 million project
 - Starting back on digesters with spring coming
 - Hoping to complete early 2018
- Rachel Bessette
 - Carboline is switching to a new foam water fire suppression system
- Randy Tews
 - Attending on behalf of ASPD
- Steve Johnson

1d

- Possible CodeRed relationship with licensed establishments with refrigeration and possible regions for notifications
 - Mentioned pipeline safety class
- Attendees discussed the ability for the LEPC meeting locations to be anywhere in the county.

- SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS AUTHORIZED BY LAW
None

- ADJOURN

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY LEON ENGLER TO ADJOURN AT 14:18.
STEVE JOHNSON SECONDED. Vote taken, MOTION CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lauri Maki
BCEM

BROWN COUNTY TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Brown County Traffic Safety Commission was held on Tuesday, January 10, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. at the Brown County Sheriff's Office.

Present:	Karl Ackerman	Chad Opicka	Randy Wiessinger
	Rachel Constine	Michael Panosh	Dan Van Lanen
	Peter Flucke	Cullen Peltier	Tom Witczak
	Dave Hansen	Dan Sandberg	Callum O'Connor
	Kimberly Hess	Bob Schuurmans	Lauri Maki

I. Call to Order

Chairman Sandberg called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m.

II. Approve Minutes

Motion was made by Witczak and seconded by Hansen to approve the minutes from the October 2016 meeting. **Motion carried.**

III. I-41 Construction Update

Schuurmans stated this item can now be taken off the agenda. All of the little projects left to do will be finished by June. There will be some lane closures in spring. Markers will be installed every 2/10 of a mile which will assist dispatchers in giving police/fire a more exact location. The county shop states there are now extra lane miles to plow in winter, so it will take longer before the county roads get plowed. Constine added that the county shop is starting an emergency response crew with 2-3 employees on call.

IV. Multi-Jurisdictional OWI Task Force Update

Panosh reported there were just over 200 OWIs in 2016. The highest number was the previous year. There were 588 fatalities in 2016 compared to 555 the previous year. Ackerman reported that Green Bay had about 25 OWIs in December. Sandberg noted that as of January 1, 2017, an OWI-4th is a felony.

V. BOTS Updates

See above.

VI. Fourth Quarter Traffic Fatalities

Sandberg reported there were 18 fatalities in Brown County in 2016. Eight of the 15 crashes (53%) were alcohol-related with an average .227 BAC, not including three of crashes which haven't been figured in yet. Panosh stated the national average for alcohol-related crashes is about 33%.

Sandberg noted that in the Brown County seat belt use study—which involved Howard, Suamico, Allouez and Denmark—only about 79% were wearing them. Those most likely to not wear them are in the 17-25 age range, which correlates with the age of the majority of fatalities.

1e

VII. Review of Fatal Crash-STH 57 and CTH K

Sandberg noted that this crash happened on July 29, 2016, at approximately 1 p.m. There was road construction going on in the area which created more traffic on CTH K. The collision analysis report showed the cause of the crash to be the victim failing to yield. This is a 4-lane road now. Schuurmans stated there is a study planned for this corridor, but it is on the to-do list. No plans yet to do anything. Ideas for making this corridor safer included limiting access or making a slot right-turn lane. Also, it was suggested to close CTH K during events such as Our Lady of Good Help in August. After discussion, it was decided that Sandberg will draft a letter to Brian Brock at DOT requesting to prioritize the study and consider short-term and long-term solutions for this corridor.

VIII. Citizen Appearances

None.

IX. Other Business as Allowed by Law

Flucke stated this year there will be just short update briefings for any officers wanting to attend as the 2-day seminars will be held in Madison and Milwaukee. He stated there needs to be an increase in awareness and a reminder to municipalities about clearing snow from sidewalks.

Hess stated the first car seat check of the year will be on Saturday, March 4, 2017, from 9:00 a.m.-11:30 a.m. at Broadway.

Constine reported there will be two big county construction projects for 2017. One is CTH D from Wrightstown to De Pere, which will last from spring to winter. The second one is CTH HS at Glendale Ave. to CTH B.

Schuurmans reported that DOT will be issuing a permit to Allouez to install a beacon/crossing signal on Riverside Drive at Sunset Court, which connects to Sunset Park, allowing pedestrians/bicyclists to cross safely. This is the first one in our area.

Hansen noted that DPW has a lot of studies planned for 2017.

Witczak stated he had seen a story on the news about teen driver awareness. He suggested it would be a good idea to set something up at the stadium parking lot where teens can practice winter driving techniques. Sandberg will check with NWTC as they have a driving track where this could be held.

Brown County Traffic Safety Commission
January 10, 2017
Page 3 of 3

Sandberg stated he will bring up at the DUG meeting this week about using digital signs to alert drivers of a wrong way driver on the highway. He noted this is used in Milwaukee.

The next meeting was set for Tuesday, April 11, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. at the Brown County Sheriff's Office.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marsha Laurent
Recording Secretary



**BROWN COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COURT HOUSE
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN**

BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Meeting Date: 4/19/2017

Agenda No. : _____

Communication
~~Motion~~ from the Floor

I make the following Communication ~~motion~~: _____

That Brown County goes on record in retaining the current prison
or finds a location for a new prison within Brown County.

Signed: [Signature]

District No.: 9

(Please deliver to the County Clerk after the motion is made for recording into the minutes.)



50

**BROWN COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COURT HOUSE
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN**

BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Meeting Date: April 19, 2017
Agenda No. : Communications

Motion from the Floor

I make the following motion: I hat the attached 3 requests
be referred to the Public Safety Committee.

Signed: [Signature]

District No.: 8

(Please deliver to the County Clerk after the motion is made for recording into the minutes.)

3

- Request for the Clerk of Courts to provide a list of CM, CF, CT, TR cases from 2014-2017 without valid driver's license or State identification information listed.
- Request from the Brown County Sheriff for a list of all ICE deportations from the Brown County Jail from Jan 1, 2014 to present.
- Request for the Brown County Sheriff to participate in a partnership with ICE which will give Sheriff deputies the power to act as federal immigrant agents in the County Jail. The program, known as 287(g), is an agreement between ICE and law enforcement agencies that, after a four-week training program, grants state and local officers the power to question and detain immigrants deemed deportable in state and local jails. The agreement gives trained sheriffs' deputies the authority to use ICE databases, question inmates about their immigration status and place inmates with deportable immigration statuses on detainers for up to 48 hours after their scheduled release to allow time for ICE agents to pick them up for deportation. According to the ICE website, there are 37 law enforcement agencies across 16 states that have such a partnership with the agency.

***How many Ice Holds/Deportation Detainers from January 2014 to present=** 130 (of these 130/ 9 were lifted by ICE and the inmate was not transported after release from Brown County)

2014 55 inmates released to ICE

2015 32 inmates released to ICE

2016 34 inmates released to ICE

2017 to date 04/21/17 9 inmates released to ICE (with 16 active in custody awaiting release)

***How many current ICE holds do we have?**

16 active ICE detainers in 2017 to date (does not include the 9 that were already released to ICE in 2017)

***Explore options of the 287g program from ICE**

History: This was explored by then Chief Deputy John Gossage on June 08, 2007. Here is the correspondence:

June 8, 2007

TO: Harold Kaye, Chairman
Brown County Public Safety Committee

FROM: John Gossage, Chief Deputy
Brown County Sheriff's Dept.

RE: I.C.E. 287 (g) Program

After numerous telephone calls to ICE and two scheduled meetings cancelled by ICE, I was able to reach a supervisor in the Chicago Field Office that answered my specific questions. On June 07, 2007, I received a return telephone call from James Mc Tiek, Field Office Director, 10 W. Congress, Suite 4000, Chicago, IL 60605, Phone: [REDACTED]. Jim stated that his area of responsibility were 6 states, those being Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Wisconsin. James stated that he received a call from Washington regarding my inquiries and was returning the call, hoping to answer some questions. Here were my specific questions regarding the 287 (g) programs, with his responses added:

What type of training is involved and who can attend the program?

James stated that only sworn officers could go through the training. (I explained that we were considering the non-sworn corrections officers to assist.) James stated that the county would be responsible for travel, lodging, and employee salaries during the five week training.

What type of support system is needed and associated maintenance cost for the access to their database?

James stated that they would provide the computers and that a T-1 line was needed. James stated that there would probably be costs associated with the set up and there would be a maintenance fee or recurring costs, but did not know how much that would be.

What authority is given to the officers once they are trained?

Jim stated that the officers are given federal authority but only when they are being supervised by a federal agent. James stressed that the 287 (g) programs did not allow for officers to go out in the community and make "sweeps" of neighborhoods looking for illegal immigrants. James stated that it is a misconception that the public has regarding the program. James stated that when ICE supervisors make arrests of "illegals", they have to follow their protocol; that being that the "illegal" has been arrested for a crime of moral turpitude or felony and is subsequently processed through their database/ ENFORCE SYSTEM. James stated that it takes approximately 2-4 hours to process 1 person through the system.

I explained to James that we currently had an agent assigned to Brown County and asked him what additional benefit would Brown County receive by entering into a MOU with ICE?

James stated that if Brown County filed an MOU with ICE, his agency would conduct a Field Survey. This field survey would look at present practice and would assess what benefits the 287 (g) program could provide. Once the assessment is complete, the survey is then turned over to Washington, D.C. and they conduct their assessment survey. If approved on both levels, the agency would be afforded the opportunity to participate in the program. James stated that the surveys may take 2-3 months.

James stated that he believed that Brown County is ahead of the curve, in that we are providing a lock up list to ICE two times a week. This allows their agent to review the possible "illegals" and follow up in a timely manner. James stated that they are in the process of drafting a letter to all Wisconsin County Sheriff's requesting that all of the agencies follow Brown County's procedure. James stated that in all likelihood Brown County, if successful in the field survey, may lose the federal position assigned to them. James stated that agents are needed in other areas throughout their 6 states. If Brown County were to become self-sufficient, they would allocate their personnel to other areas. I indicated that we did not want that to happen and reassured James that the current established practice and relationship was working well.

I asked James what the advantage would be for Brown County to get involved?

James indicated that, quite honestly, he did not see a benefit at all. I concluded my conversation with James and spoke with Sheriff Kocken, who had listened to the latter part of the telephone conversation. Both Sheriff Kocken and I concur that any further consideration into this matter may jeopardize the federal personnel assigned to this area.

FORWARD TO TODAY'S STANDARDS

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted a review of the 287(g) delegation of authority program during the period from February 2009 through July 2009, and published its findings in March 2010. In September of 2012, DHS OIG released their report entitled "The Performance of 287(g) Agreements FY 2012 Follow-Up".

Since the audits were conducted, ICE has closed out all recommendations for both audits based on revisions to the 287(g) program in furtherance of strengthening public safety and ensuring consistency in immigration enforcement across the country by prioritizing the arrest and detention of criminal aliens.

To improve 287(g) program operations, ICE has done the following:

- Implemented comprehensive guidelines for ICE field offices that supervise 287(g) partnerships, prioritizing the arrest and detention of criminal aliens.
- Requires 287(g) officers to maintain comprehensive alien arrest, detention, and removal data in order to ensure enforcement efforts remain focused on criminal aliens, particularly those who pose the greatest risk to public safety.
- Strengthened the 287(g) basic training course and created a new refresher training course, providing detailed instruction on the terms and requirements of the MOA and the responsibilities of a 287(g) officer.
- Deployed additional supervisors to the field to ensure greater oversight over 287(g) operations.
- Established an Internal Advisory Committee, which includes the DHS CRCL, to review and assess ICE field office recommendations about pending 287(g) applications.

The Revised 287(g) MOA

- After extensive coordination between several ICE components to include ERO, Homeland Security Investigations, Office of the Principal Legal Advisor, Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Policy, Office of Privacy, and the DHS CRCL, and with consideration given to recommendations made by OIG in their published report, OIG-11-19, The Performance of 287(g) Agreements FY 2011 Update, a new version of the MOA was created and approved in 2013.
- This updated document will ensure clarity, consistency and uniformity with current ICE policies and procedures and includes enhancements to the previous MOA relating to:
 - training requirements;

- the OPR inspection review process;
- program supervision;
- ICE's civil immigration enforcement priorities;
- civil rights standards;
- complaint procedures;
- release of information to the media;
- the credentialing process;
- statistical reporting requirements.

Oversight and Supervision

- ICE has increased its human capital resources to enhance 287(g) program's mission and objectives and implemented national training programs for ICE field personnel and Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) personnel.
- ERO currently has seven (7) National Program Managers in Washington, D.C. and twenty-one (21) Field Program Managers within close proximity to active MOAs, tasked with oversight and management.

Benefits

- By working together, local and federal officers can better identify and remove criminal aliens – a tremendous benefit to public safety.
- One of the biggest benefits to our 287(g) partners is that they are able to better identify individuals in custody.
- The 287(g) program continues to receive overwhelmingly positive feedback from its partners.
- Our state and local law enforcement partners have become a force multiplier, allowing ICE to actively engage more officers/agents into ongoing enforcement operations nationwide that require increased manpower.

Racial Profiling

- Racial profiling is simply not something that will be tolerated, and any indication of racial profiling will be treated with the utmost scrutiny and fully investigated. If any proof of racial profiling is uncovered, that specific officer or department will have their authority and/or agreement rescinded.
- In addition to the training these officers receive from their local departments, the 287(g) training includes coursework on multicultural communication and the avoidance of racial profiling.

287(g) Training Programs

- Prior to being delegated ICE immigration authority, selected state and local officers must attend and successfully complete ICE's 287(g) Immigration Authority Delegation Program (IADP), which is the 287(g) basic training course.
- The basic training program is four weeks in duration and includes coursework in immigration law, the use of ICE databases, multi-cultural communication and the avoidance of racial profiling. This training is conducted at Federal Law Enforcement Training Center – Charleston.
- Additionally, every two years, every 287(g) state and local officer must return to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Charleston, SC and successfully complete Immigration Authority Delegation Refresher Training Program (IADRP).

END

The only notable change is that the training for the 287 g program was reduced from 5 weeks in 2007 to 4 weeks in 2010. The requirement remains the same in that a refresher course is needed every two years.

CURRENT POLICY

We currently contact ICE, as a matter of policy, whenever we arrest and book an individual into the Brown County Jail that is a foreign born national. ICE reviews their database and determines whether or not they want to speak with the party. If they want to speak with the party it usually occurs via telephone; which the jail accommodates. Not every foreign born national has detainers. We average 35-40 foreign born nationals on any given day. If ICE wants to place a detainer on that individual they will speak with the jail staff. Our staff will make the notation of the detainer. Once the party has been to court and a sentence has been determined, the jail staff will contact ICE with a release date for the inmate for the charge that they were arrested for to bring them to jail (local charge). ICE has 48 hours to pick up the inmate on the detainer. If ICE does not pick up the inmate within the 48 hours the inmate is released.

As I noted in the June 08, 2007 document to then Brown County Public Safety Chairman Harold Kaye, there is no benefit to Brown County to train or enter into this type of agreement with ICE. We would, in essence, be doing the work that the ICE agents are currently doing. ICE does a very thorough inspection of records and has been responsive to Brown County's needs. For these reasons I will not be exploring the 287g option with ICE.

Brown County Sheriff John Gossage// April 25, 2017

May 17, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

2016 BALANCED BUDGET ADJUSTMENT

WHEREAS, certain surpluses, overdrafts and shortfalls have developed in various departmental budgets for 2016; and

WHEREAS, these surpluses, overdrafts and shortfalls are the result of the following:

- **Clerk of Courts**

- Public charges and fees – These revenue accounts had a net deficit of (\$112,513), which was 10.6% below the budgeted amounts.
- Fines and forfeitures – These revenue accounts had a net surplus of \$64,934, which was 10.1% above the budgeted amounts.
- All other accounts had a net deficit of (\$13,065),

Resulting in an appropriation needed of \$60,644.

- **Medical Examiner**

- Professional services – This expense account had a net deficit of (\$221,302), which was 54.5% above the budgeted amounts.
- Wages and benefits – These expense accounts had a net deficit of (\$41,925), which was 15.1% above the budgeted amounts.
- Revenues – Revenues in total were \$6,571 above the budgeted amounts, which was only 0.7% above the budgeted amounts.
- All other expense accounts had a net surplus of \$55,952,

Resulting in an appropriation needed of \$200,704.

- **Museum**

- Public charges for services – These revenue accounts had a net deficit of (\$43,712), which was 25.4% below budgeted amounts.
- All other accounts had a net surplus of \$25,181,

Resulting in an appropriation needed of \$18,531.

- **Treasurer**

- Property tax interest and penalties – These revenue accounts had a net deficit of (\$333,869), which was 23.8% below budgeted amounts.
- Investment interest and market adjustments -- These revenue accounts had a net deficit of (\$264,303), which was 34.6% below budgeted amounts
- Tax deed related items – These revenues and expense accounts have a net surplus of \$24,554 as compared to budgeted amounts.

4

- Ag use conversion penalty – This revenue account has a surplus of \$35,752, which is 143.0% above budgeted amounts.
- All other accounts had a net deficit of (\$1,591),

Resulting in an appropriation needed of \$539,457.

- **UW Extension**

- The departmental deficit is (\$413), which is only 0.10% of the property tax levy for the department. No further analysis was completed related to the net deficit,

Resulting in an appropriation needed of \$413.

- **Community Programs**

- Expenses were (\$649,680) over budget, primarily due to increased mental health in-patient services for children, adolescents and adults, and higher than expected placements in foster care.
- Revenues were \$2,128,892 over budget, primarily due to higher than expected provider audit refunds, a favorable WI Medicaid Cost Reporting (WIMCR) settlement, and significantly higher case management and service revenues associated with mental health services for a net departmental surplus of \$1,479,212
- After taking the County Board action of 01-18-2017 into account to commit \$75,000 of fund balance for the 2017 budget, a total of \$630,805 remains available in fund balance for subsequent years expenditures,

Resulting in an appropriation needed of zero.

- **Community Treatment Center**

- Expenses were \$182,048 under budget, primarily due to staffing costs less than anticipated after previous budget adjustment based on higher than expected census in the hospital and Community Based Residential Facility (CBRF).
- Revenues were (\$1,049,781) under budget, primarily due to a prior year billing correction by the WI Department of Health Services, a revised fee structure for the CBRF, and an increased number of consumers without adequate funding in the hospital, for a net departmental deficit of (\$867,733).
- Including future year pension activity, Community Treatment Center has an unrestricted fund equity balance of \$909,383,

Resulting in an appropriation needed of \$867,733; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to make appropriations to cover these various departmental deficits in order to balance these budgets for the past year; and

WHEREAS, the County Board increased the Sheriff's budget levy by \$616,445 in 2016, and by \$890,344 in 2017, and the Sheriff currently has a budget of \$38,640,767; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriff indicates there remains a need for an additional \$8,500 in his 2016 budget for squad camera purchases.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors that there be appropriated from the General Fund and placed in the 2016 departmental budget the following amounts:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Clerk of Circuit Court	\$ 60,644
Medical Examiner	\$ 200,704
Museum	\$ 18,531
UW Extension	\$ 413; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors that the following department recognized a shortfall in its appropriation to the General Fund in 2016:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Treasurer	\$539,457; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors that there be appropriated from the Community Treatment Center fund and placed in the 2016 departmental budget the following amount:

<u>Department/Fund</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Community Treatment Center	\$867,733; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors that the amount of \$8,500 shall be transferred from the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance and shall increase the Sheriff's Office 2017 budget by \$8,500 for squad camera purchases.

<u>Department/Fund</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Sheriff	\$8,500

Respectfully submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
EDUCATION & RECREATION
COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT &
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Approved By:

Troy Streckenbach,
COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by: Administration

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

Fiscal Note: This Resolution requires an appropriation from the General Fund as outlined in the resolution. As of 4-14-2017, the General Fund decreased from 2015 to 2016 by \$512,756 (unaudited). The Unassigned General Fund Balance as of the same date is \$24,503,429 (unaudited), so sufficient funds are available to transfer to the Sheriff's Office.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROLL CALL # _____

Motion made by Supervisor _____

Seconded by Supervisor _____

SUPERVISORS	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
SIEBER	1				
DE WANE	2				
NICHOLSON	3				
HOYER	4				
GRUSZYNSKI	5				
LEFEBVRE	6				
ERICKSON	7				
ZIMA	8				
EVANS	9				
VANDER LEESE	10				
BUCKLEY	11				
LANDWEHR	12				
DANTINNE, JR	13				

SUPERVISORS	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
BRUSKY	14				
BALLARD	15				
KASTER	16				
VAN DYCK	17				
LINSEN	18				
KNEISZEL	19				
CLANCY	20				
CAMPBELL	21				
MOYNIHAN, JR.	22				
BLOM	23				
SCHADEWALD	24				
LUND	25				
BECKER	26				

Total Votes Cast _____

Motion: Adopted _____ Defeated _____ Tabled _____

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WI 54305-3600

CHAD WEININGER

PHONE (920) 448-4037 FAX (920) 448-4036 WEB: www.co.brown.wi.us

DIRECTOR

RESOLUTION/ORDINANCE SUBMISSION TO COUNTY BOARD

DATE: April 18, 2017
REQUEST TO: Administration, Education & Recreation, Executive, Human Services, Planning, Development & Transportation, Public Safety Committee
MEETING DATES: May 3, April 27, May 8, April 26, April 24, and May 3, 2017
REQUEST FROM: Chad Weininger
Department of Administration Director
REQUEST TYPE: ☒ New resolution ☐ Revision to resolution
☐ New ordinance ☐ Revision to ordinance

TITLE: 2016 Budget Overdraft and Shortfall Appropriations

ISSUE/BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Attached is the resolution to appropriate additional funds for 2016 departmental budgetary shortfall.

- The following departments require additional appropriations from the General Fund to cover the deficits.
 - Clerk of Circuit Court
 - Medical Examiner
 - Museum
 - UW Extension
- The County Treasurer will recognize a shortfall in appropriations to the General Fund.
- Community Treatment Center requires an additional appropriation from its respective fund balance to cover the deficit.
- The Sheriff's department needs an additional \$8,500 to complete a 2016 project.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Please approve the attached resolution to authorize additional appropriations for 2016 overdrafts and shortfalls.

FISCAL IMPACT:

NOTE: This fiscal impact portion is initially completed by requestor, but verified by the DOA and updated if necessary.

1. Is there a fiscal impact? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - a. If yes, what is the amount of the impact? See Attached Resolution
 - b. If part of a bigger project, what is the total amount of the project? \$_____
 - c. Is it currently budgeted? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 1. If yes, in which account? _____
 2. If no, how will the impact be funded? _____

☒ COPY OF RESOLUTION OR ORDINANCE IS ATTACHED

1 4


	Annual Budget	YTD Actual	YTD 2015 Actual	YTD 2016 Actual	YTD Difference
Personnel Costs	\$ 1,712,513	\$ 1,720,640	\$ 1,715,101	\$ 1,720,640	\$ 5,538
Operating Expenses	\$ 135,377	\$ 126,257	\$ 143,615	\$ 126,257	\$ (17,357)
Interpreter Services	\$ 95,000	\$ 91,520	\$ 99,872	\$ 91,520	\$ (8,352)
Attorney Fees	\$ 190,000	\$ 180,263	\$ 166,296	\$ 180,263	\$ 13,967
GAL - Juvenile	\$ 76,500	\$ 82,288	\$ 75,628	\$ 82,288	\$ 6,660
GAL - Probate	\$ 130,000	\$ 124,080	\$ 126,976	\$ 124,080	\$ (2,896)
GAL - Family & Paternity	\$ 336,053	\$ 369,826	\$ 356,578	\$ 369,826	\$ 13,248
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfer Out	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total		\$ 2,694,873	\$ 2,684,066	\$ 2,694,873	\$ 10,807


Property Tax Revenue	\$ 732,231	\$ 732,231	\$ 693,570	\$ 732,231	\$ 38,661
Intergovernmental	\$ 172,862	\$ 175,205	\$ 162,931	\$ 175,205	\$ 12,275
Public Charges	\$ 1,100,600	\$ 1,119,708	\$ 1,075,826	\$ 1,119,708	\$ 43,883
Charges & Fees - Interpreter	\$ 61,750	\$ 59,748	\$ 84,213	\$ 59,748	\$ (24,465)
Charges & Fees - Atty Fees	\$ 170,000	\$ 132,796	\$ 128,338	\$ 132,796	\$ 4,459
Charges & Fees - GAL Fees	\$ 430,000	\$ 400,356	\$ 399,536	\$ 400,356	\$ 820
Miscellaneous Rev	\$ -	\$ 190	\$ 16	\$ 190	\$ 174
Interest & Investment Earnings	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,979	\$ 6,658	\$ 10,979	\$ 4,321
Transfer In	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total		\$ 2,631,214	\$ 2,551,087	\$ 2,631,214	\$ 80,127

YTD Difference

(\$132,979) (\$63,659) \$ 69,320 Improvement
From 2015 to 2016

Clerk of Courts - December 2016






For Month Ended 12/31/16 ***PRELIMINARY & UNAUDITED***

Fiscal Year to Date 12/31/16
Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account


Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund										
REVENUE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
4100	General property taxes	732,231.00	.00	732,231.00	61,019.25	.00	732,231.00	.00	100	693,570.00
4302	State grant and aid revenue	172,862.00	.00	172,862.00	.00	.00	175,205.00	(2,343.00)	101	162,930.50
4302	State grant and aid revenue	61,750.00	.00	61,750.00	17,070.26	.00	59,747.75	2,002.25	97	84,212.65
4302.122	State grant and aid revenue Interpreter	\$234,612.00	\$0.00	\$234,612.00	\$17,070.26	\$0.00	\$234,952.75	(\$340.75)	100%	\$247,143.15
4302 - State grant and aid revenue Totals										
4401	Licenses	600.00	.00	600.00	40.00	.00	440.00	160.00	73	360.00
4401.123	Licenses Occupational	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$600.00	\$40.00	\$0.00	\$440.00	\$160.00	73%	\$360.00
4500	County ordinance forfeitures	250,000.00	.00	250,000.00	3,949.53	.00	278,319.80	(28,319.80)	111	294,631.74
4503	Penal fines for civil fees	290,000.00	.00	290,000.00	22,033.27	.00	319,267.68	(29,267.68)	110	280,430.54
4505	Bail forfeitures	100,000.00	.00	100,000.00	4,089.84	.00	107,346.96	(7,346.96)	107	69,771.74
4600	Charges and fees	185,000.00	.00	185,000.00	12,386.16	.00	161,816.98	23,183.02	87	171,918.45
4600.120	Charges and fees Clerk of court	275,000.00	.00	275,000.00	14,502.46	.00	252,516.85	22,483.15	92	258,713.27
4600.121	Charges and fees Court	170,000.00	.00	170,000.00	15,000.09	.00	132,796.37	37,203.63	78	128,337.76
4600.123	Charges and fees Attorney	430,000.00	.00	430,000.00	38,044.86	.00	400,356.40	29,643.60	93	399,536.12
4600.124	Charges and fees Guardian Ad Litem	\$1,060,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,060,000.00	\$79,933.57	\$0.00	\$947,486.60	\$112,513.40	89%	\$958,505.60
4900	Miscellaneous	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	16.00
4905	Interest	8,000.00	.00	8,000.00	1,786.46	.00	10,979.17	(2,979.17)	137	6,657.87
4990	Cash Over/Short	.00	.00	.00	189.94	.00	189.94	(189.94)	+++	.00
Division 001 - General Totals										
Division 012 - Clerk of Courts Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS										
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5100	Regular earnings	1,279,993.00	.00	1,279,993.00	100,441.96	.00	1,035,509.54	244,483.46	81	1,050,813.93
5100.998	Regular earnings Budget only	(52,627.00)	.00	(52,627.00)	.00	.00	.00	(52,627.00)	0	.00
5100 - Regular earnings Totals										
5102	Paid leave earnings	\$1,227,366.00	\$0.00	\$1,227,366.00	\$100,441.96	\$0.00	\$1,035,509.54	\$191,856.46	84%	\$1,050,813.93
5102.100	Paid leave earnings Vacation	.00	.00	.00	11,933.76	.00	87,812.27	(87,812.27)	+++	95,750.30
5102.200	Paid leave earnings Personal	.00	.00	.00	4,884.82	.00	18,086.71	(18,086.71)	+++	17,350.02
5102.300	Paid leave earnings Casual time used	.00	.00	.00	9,896.16	.00	21,362.28	(21,362.28)	+++	21,005.86
5102.400	Paid leave earnings Sick	.00	.00	.00	396.32	.00	396.32	(396.32)	+++	50.01
5102.500	Paid leave earnings Holiday	.00	.00	.00	16,871.96	.00	33,643.41	(33,643.41)	+++	33,844.79
5102.600	Paid leave earnings Other (funeral, jury duty, etc)	.00	.00	.00	267.30	.00	3,794.04	(3,794.04)	+++	1,717.75



For Month Ended 12/31/16 ***PRELIMINARY & UNAUDITED***

Fiscal Year to Date 12/31/16
Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund										
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5102 - Paid leave earnings Totals										
5103	Premium	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$44,250.32	\$0.00	\$165,095.03	(\$165,095.03)	+++	\$169,718.73
5103.000	Premium Overtime	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	.00	.00	198.64	2,801.36	7	217.92
5103.100	Premium Comp time payout	.00	.00	.00	945.42	.00	1,143.05	(1,143.05)	+++	589.50
5103 - Premium Totals										
5109	Salaries reimbursement	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$945.42	\$0.00	\$1,341.69	\$1,658.31	45%	\$807.42
5109.100	Salaries reimbursement Short term disability	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	(2,633.96)	2,633.96	+++	(5,591.99)
5109.200	Salaries reimbursement IV-D	(20,000.00)	.00	(20,000.00)	(1,341.31)	.00	(16,095.72)	(3,904.28)	80	(16,095.72)
5109 - Salaries reimbursement Totals										
5110	Fringe benefits	(\$20,000.00)	\$0.00	(\$20,000.00)	(\$1,341.31)	\$0.00	(\$18,729.68)	(\$1,270.32)	94%	(\$21,687.71)
5110.100	Fringe benefits FICA	94,306.00	.00	94,306.00	10,146.42	.00	86,096.93	8,209.07	91	88,053.81
5110.110	Fringe benefits Unemployment compensation	3,026.00	.00	3,026.00	270.06	.00	2,595.17	430.83	86	2,694.10
5110.200	Fringe benefits Health Insurance	299,470.00	.00	299,470.00	39,320.54	.00	321,911.07	(22,441.07)	107	297,202.43
5110.210	Fringe benefits Dental Insurance	28,623.00	.00	28,623.00	3,323.63	.00	26,812.73	1,810.27	94	26,086.02
5110.220	Fringe benefits Life Insurance	3,078.00	.00	3,078.00	306.58	.00	2,102.37	975.63	68	2,511.37
5110.230	Fringe benefits LT disability Insurance	4,557.00	.00	4,557.00	498.22	.00	4,100.99	456.01	90	4,210.28
5110.235	Fringe benefits Disability Insurance	13,730.00	.00	13,730.00	1,146.00	.00	13,730.00	.00	100	10,976.00
5110.240	Fringe benefits Workers compensation Insurance	1,922.00	.00	1,922.00	162.00	.00	1,922.00	.00	100	1,394.00
5110.300	Fringe benefits Retirement	87,890.00	.00	87,890.00	9,585.24	.00	78,151.76	9,738.24	89	82,320.79
5110 - Fringe benefits Totals										
5198	Fringe benefits - Budget only	\$536,602.00	\$0.00	\$536,602.00	\$64,758.69	\$0.00	\$537,423.02	(\$821.02)	100%	\$515,448.80
5300	Supplies	(34,425.00)	.00	(34,425.00)	.00	.00	.00	(34,425.00)	0	.00
5300	Supplies	7,526.00	.00	7,526.00	316.25	.00	8,144.42	(618.42)	108	8,545.74
5300.001	Supplies Office	8,000.00	.00	8,000.00	689.63	.00	10,830.29	(2,830.29)	135	10,019.71
5300.004	Supplies Postage	33,000.00	.00	33,000.00	5,271.79	.00	32,801.68	198.32	99	35,232.20
5300 - Supplies Totals										
5304	Printing	\$48,526.00	\$0.00	\$48,526.00	\$6,277.67	\$0.00	\$51,776.39	(\$3,250.39)	107%	\$53,797.65
5304	Printing	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	.00	.00	3,157.11	(157.11)	105	3,146.39
5304.100	Printing Forms	800.00	.00	800.00	.00	.00	.00	800.00	0	196.61
5304 - Printing Totals										
5305	Dues and memberships	\$3,800.00	\$0.00	\$3,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,157.11	\$642.89	83%	\$3,343.00
5330	Books, periodicals, subscription	300.00	.00	300.00	.00	.00	345.00	(45.00)	115	430.00
5340	Travel and training	288.00	.00	288.00	.00	.00	391.71	(103.71)	136	327.09
5410	Insurance	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	6.48	.00	4,008.88	(1,008.88)	134	1,342.36
5410.400	Insurance Bond	147.00	.00	147.00	.00	.00	394.00	(247.00)	268	.00
5410 - Insurance Totals										
5505	Telephone	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$394.00	(\$247.00)	268%	\$0.00
		480.00	.00	480.00	37.12	.00	436.11	43.89	91	671.52



For Month Ended 12/31/16 ***PRELIMINARY & UNAUDITED***

Fiscal Year to Date 12/31/16
Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund										
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5601 Intra-county expense										
5601.100	Intra-county expense Technology services	8,605.00	.00	8,605.00	758.26	.00	8,800.21	(195.21)	102	7,216.76
5601.200	Intra-county expense Insurance	9,301.00	.00	9,301.00	776.00	.00	9,301.00	.00	100	10,464.00
5601.300	Intra-county expense Other departmental	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	30.00
5601.400	Intra-county expense Copy center	19,000.00	.00	19,000.00	1,228.22	.00	17,283.70	1,716.30	91	18,506.33
5601.450	Intra-county expense Departmental copiers	5,760.00	.00	5,760.00	480.00	.00	5,760.00	.00	100	4,725.00
5601.550	Intra-county expense Document center	19,140.00	.00	19,140.00	2,008.31	.00	13,215.74	5,924.26	69	27,275.04
5601 - Intra-county expense Totals		\$61,806.00	\$0.00	\$61,806.00	\$5,250.79	\$0.00	\$54,360.65	\$7,445.35	88%	\$68,217.13
5700	Contracted services	17,000.00	.00	17,000.00	2,627.23	.00	11,387.58	5,612.42	67	15,485.81
5784	Interpreter services	95,000.00	.00	95,000.00	9,022.86	.00	91,520.06	3,479.94	96	99,871.71
5785	Attorney Fees	190,000.00	.00	190,000.00	51,689.41	.00	180,262.87	9,737.13	95	166,296.31
5787 Guardian Ad Litem										
5787.100	Guardian Ad Litem Juvenile	76,500.00	.00	76,500.00	20,357.50	.00	82,287.78	(5,787.78)	108	75,627.90
5787.200	Guardian Ad Litem Probate	130,000.00	.00	130,000.00	22,941.96	.00	124,079.54	5,920.46	95	126,975.77
5787.300	Guardian Ad Litem Family & Paternity	336,053.00	.00	336,053.00	99,676.21	.00	369,825.84	(33,772.84)	110	356,578.30
5787 - Guardian Ad Litem Totals		\$542,553.00	\$0.00	\$542,553.00	\$142,975.67	\$0.00	\$576,193.16	(\$33,640.16)	106%	\$559,181.97
Division 001 - General Totals		\$2,675,443.00	\$0.00	\$2,675,443.00	\$426,942.31	\$0.00	\$2,694,873.12	(\$19,430.12)	101%	\$2,684,065.72
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts Totals		\$2,675,443.00	\$0.00	\$2,675,443.00	\$426,942.31	\$0.00	\$2,694,873.12	(\$19,430.12)	101%	\$2,684,065.72
EXPENSE TOTALS		\$2,675,443.00	\$0.00	\$2,675,443.00	\$426,942.31	\$0.00	\$2,694,873.12	(\$19,430.12)	101%	\$2,684,065.72
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS										
EXPENSE TOTALS										
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$236,830.19)	\$0.00	(\$63,659.22)	\$63,659.22		(\$132,979.08)
Grand Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS		2,675,443.00	.00	2,675,443.00	190,112.12	.00	2,631,213.90	44,229.10	98%	2,551,086.64
EXPENSE TOTALS		2,675,443.00	.00	2,675,443.00	426,942.31	.00	2,694,873.12	(19,430.12)	101%	2,684,065.72
Grand Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$236,830.19)	\$0.00	(\$63,659.22)	\$63,659.22		(\$132,979.08)



For Month Ended 12/31/15

Fiscal Year to Date 12/31/15

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund	REVENUE									
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts	Division 001 - General									
4100	General property taxes	693,570.00	.00	693,570.00	57,797.50	.00	693,570.00	.00	100	672,857.00
4302	State grant and aid revenue	152,999.00	.00	152,999.00	.00	.00	162,930.50	(9,931.50)	106	151,997.50
4302.122	State grant and aid revenue Interpreter	.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	28,382.53	.00	84,212.65	(24,212.65)	140	.00
	4302 - State grant and aid revenue Totals	\$152,999.00	\$60,000.00	\$212,999.00	\$28,382.53	\$0.00	\$247,143.15	(\$34,144.15)	116%	\$151,997.50
4401	Licenses	800.00	.00	800.00	20.00	.00	360.00	440.00	45	720.00
4401.123	Licenses Occupational	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$800.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$360.00	\$440.00	45%	\$720.00
4500	County ordinance forfeitures	240,000.00	.00	240,000.00	20,858.02	.00	294,631.74	(54,631.74)	123	234,828.62
4503	Penal fines for civil fees	350,000.00	.00	350,000.00	24,439.47	.00	280,430.54	69,569.46	80	282,134.01
4505	Ball forfeitures	105,000.00	.00	105,000.00	1,092.50	.00	69,771.74	35,228.26	66	115,283.02
4600	Charges and fees	174,000.00	.00	174,000.00	8,605.19	.00	171,918.45	2,081.55	99	93,993.48
4600.120	Charges and fees Clerk of court	265,000.00	.00	265,000.00	18,136.66	.00	258,713.27	6,286.73	98	280,972.50
4600.121	Charges and fees Court	60,000.00	(60,000.00)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	61,770.53
4600.122	Charges and fees Interpreter	143,000.00	.00	143,000.00	(6,224.31)	.00	128,337.76	14,662.24	90	184,369.06
4600.123	Charges and fees Attorney	526,000.00	.00	526,000.00	22,011.27	.00	399,536.12	126,463.88	76	440,799.03
4600.124	Charges and fees Guardian Ad Litem	\$1,168,000.00	(\$60,000.00)	\$1,108,000.00	\$42,528.81	\$0.00	\$958,505.60	\$149,494.40	87%	\$1,061,904.60
4900	Miscellaneous	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	16.00	(16.00)	+++	.00
4905	Interest	1,200.00	.00	1,200.00	1,367.50	.00	6,657.87	(5,457.87)	555	1,264.54
9002	Transfer in HR	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	7,272.47
9002.200	Transfer in HR	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	+++	\$7,272.47
	9002 - Transfer in Totals	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$176,486.33	\$0.00	\$2,551,086.64	\$160,482.36	94%	\$2,528,261.76
	Division 001 - General Totals	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$176,486.33	\$0.00	\$2,551,086.64	\$160,482.36	94%	\$2,528,261.76
	Department 012 - Clerk of Courts Totals	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$176,486.33	\$0.00	\$2,551,086.64	\$160,482.36	94%	\$2,528,261.76
	REVENUE TOTALS	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$176,486.33	\$0.00	\$2,551,086.64	\$160,482.36	94%	\$2,528,261.76
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts	Division 001 - General									
5100	Regular earnings	1,272,566.00	.00	1,272,566.00	101,093.22	.00	1,050,813.93	221,752.07	83	1,059,052.39
5100.998	Regular earnings Budget only	(32,850.00)	.00	(32,850.00)	.00	.00	.00	(32,850.00)	0	.00
	5100 - Regular earnings Totals	\$1,239,716.00	\$0.00	\$1,239,716.00	\$101,093.22	\$0.00	\$1,050,813.93	\$188,902.07	85%	\$1,059,052.39
5102	Paid leave earnings	.00	.00	.00	13,403.00	.00	95,750.30	(95,750.30)	+++	106,855.57
5102.100	Paid leave earnings Vacation	.00	.00	.00	4,947.46	.00	17,350.02	(17,350.02)	+++	17,428.26
5102.200	Paid leave earnings Personal	.00	.00	.00	7,115.98	.00	21,005.86	(21,005.86)	+++	22,641.82
5102.300	Paid leave earnings Casual time used	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00



For Month Ended 12/31/15

Fiscal Year to Date 12/31/15

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Budget	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund	EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts											
Division 001 - General											
5102	Paid leave earnings										
5102.400	Paid leave earnings Sick	.00	.00	.00	.00	50.01	.00	50.01	(50.01)	+++	.00
5102.500	Paid leave earnings Holiday	.00	.00	.00	.00	16,559.00	.00	33,844.79	(33,844.79)	+++	36,544.99
5102.600	Paid leave earnings Other (funeral, jury duty, etc)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	1,717.75	(1,717.75)	+++	3,428.12
	5102 - Paid leave earnings Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$42,075.45	\$0.00	\$169,718.73	(\$169,718.73)	+++	\$186,898.76
5103	Premium										
5103.000	Premium Overtime	3,000.00	.00	.00	3,000.00	15.71	.00	217.92	2,782.08	7	698.44
5103.100	Premium Comp time payout	.00	.00	.00	.00	430.88	.00	589.50	(589.50)	+++	632.74
	5103 - Premium Totals	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$446.59	\$0.00	\$807.42	\$2,192.58	27%	\$1,331.18
5109	Salaries reimbursement										
5109.100	Salaries reimbursement Short term disability	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	(5,591.99)	5,591.99	+++	(12,690.89)
5109.200	Salaries reimbursement IV-D	(18,000.00)	.00	.00	(18,000.00)	(1,341.31)	.00	(16,095.72)	(1,904.28)	89	(15,896.28)
	5109 - Salaries reimbursement Totals	(\$18,000.00)	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$18,000.00)	(\$1,341.31)	\$0.00	(\$21,687.71)	\$3,687.71	120%	(\$28,587.17)
5110	Fringe benefits										
5110.100	Fringe benefits FICA	93,753.00	.00	.00	93,753.00	10,237.22	.00	88,053.81	5,699.19	94	89,324.18
5110.110	Fringe benefits Unemployment compensation	3,188.00	.00	.00	3,188.00	314.40	.00	2,694.10	493.90	85	4,317.44
5110.200	Fringe benefits Health Insurance	303,254.00	.00	.00	303,254.00	24,123.14	.00	297,202.43	6,051.57	98	307,637.22
5110.210	Fringe benefits Dental Insurance	29,704.00	.00	.00	29,704.00	2,139.26	.00	26,086.02	3,617.98	88	27,102.94
5110.220	Fringe benefits Life Insurance	3,663.00	.00	.00	3,663.00	194.30	.00	2,511.37	1,151.63	69	3,062.00
5110.230	Fringe benefits LT disability insurance	4,797.00	.00	.00	4,797.00	332.93	.00	4,210.28	586.72	88	4,468.87
5110.235	Fringe benefits Disability insurance	10,976.00	.00	.00	10,976.00	911.00	.00	10,976.00	.00	100	10,976.40
5110.240	Fringe benefits Workers compensation Insurance	1,394.00	.00	.00	1,394.00	118.00	.00	1,394.00	.00	100	1,401.00
5110.300	Fringe benefits Retirement	89,813.00	.00	.00	89,813.00	9,620.97	.00	82,320.79	7,492.21	92	86,329.03
5110.310	Fringe benefits Retirement credit	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	2,565.74
	5110 - Fringe benefits Totals	\$540,542.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$540,542.00	\$47,991.22	\$0.00	\$515,448.80	\$25,093.20	95%	\$537,184.82
5198	Fringe benefits - Budget only	1,489.00	.00	.00	1,489.00	.00	.00	.00	1,489.00	0	.00
5300	Supplies										
5300	Supplies	11,265.00	.00	.00	11,265.00	1,838.35	.00	8,545.74	2,719.26	76	9,137.01
5300.001	Supplies Office	8,000.00	.00	.00	8,000.00	1,771.40	.00	10,019.71	(2,019.71)	125	8,331.92
5300.004	Supplies Postage	33,000.00	.00	.00	33,000.00	2,880.65	.00	35,232.20	(2,232.20)	107	33,885.31
	5300 - Supplies Totals	\$52,265.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$52,265.00	\$6,490.40	\$0.00	\$53,797.65	(\$1,532.65)	103%	\$51,354.24
5304	Printing										
5304	Printing	2,200.00	.00	.00	2,200.00	.00	.00	3,146.39	(946.39)	143	2,161.43
5304.100	Printing Forms	800.00	.00	.00	800.00	.00	.00	196.61	603.39	25	751.31
	5304 - Printing Totals	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,343.00	(\$343.00)	111%	\$2,912.74
5305	Dues and memberships	250.00	.00	.00	250.00	.00	.00	430.00	(180.00)	172	250.00
5330	Books, periodicals, subscription	.00	350.00	.00	350.00	24.00	.00	327.09	22.91	93	.00



For Month Ended 12/31/15

Fiscal Year to Date 12/31/15


Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund											
EXPENSE											
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts											
Division 001 - General											
5340	Travel and training	1,200.00	(350.00)	850.00	6.90	.00	.00	1,342.36	(492.36)	158	466.88
5410	Insurance										
5410.400	Insurance Bond	147.00	.00	147.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	147.00	0	142.25
	5410 - Insurance Totals	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	0%	\$142.25
5505	Telephone	1,100.00	.00	1,100.00	72.46	.00	.00	671.52	428.48	61	980.19
5601	Intra-county expense										
5601.100	Intra-county expense Technology services	8,113.00	.00	8,113.00	843.23	.00	.00	7,216.76	896.24	89	8,019.77
5601.200	Intra-county expense Insurance	10,464.00	.00	10,464.00	872.00	.00	.00	10,464.00	.00	100	11,301.96
5601.300	Intra-county expense Other departmental	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	30.00	(30.00)	+++	.00
5601.400	Intra-county expense Copy center	20,000.00	.00	20,000.00	1,243.03	.00	.00	18,506.33	1,493.67	93	19,391.66
5601.450	Intra-county expense Departmental copiers	4,725.00	.00	4,725.00	393.75	.00	.00	4,725.00	.00	100	4,725.00
5601.550	Intra-county expense Document center	46,397.00	.00	46,397.00	4,336.13	.00	.00	27,275.04	19,121.96	59	.00
	5601 - Intra-county expense Totals	\$89,699.00	\$0.00	\$89,699.00	\$7,668.14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$68,217.13	\$21,481.87	76%	\$43,438.39
5700	Contracted services	11,000.00	.00	11,000.00	511.02	.00	.00	15,485.81	(4,485.81)	141	13,298.37
5784	Interpreter services	95,000.00	.00	95,000.00	5,624.86	.00	.00	99,871.71	(4,871.71)	105	103,434.51
5785	Attorney Fees	190,000.00	.00	190,000.00	36,797.59	.00	.00	166,296.31	23,703.69	88	230,759.02
5787	Guardian Ad Litem										
5787.100	Guardian Ad Litem Juvenile	75,000.00	.00	75,000.00	21,918.06	.00	.00	75,627.90	(627.90)	101	78,975.03
5787.200	Guardian Ad Litem Probate	125,000.00	.00	125,000.00	10,146.83	.00	.00	126,975.77	(1,975.77)	102	147,790.53
5787.300	Guardian Ad Litem Family & Paternity	301,161.00	.00	301,161.00	77,812.79	.00	.00	356,578.30	(55,417.30)	118	394,780.46
	5787 - Guardian Ad Litem Totals	\$501,161.00	\$0.00	\$501,161.00	\$109,877.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$559,181.97	(\$58,020.97)	112%	\$621,546.02
	Division 001 - General Totals	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$357,358.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,684,065.72	\$27,503.28	99%	\$2,824,462.59
	Department 012 - Clerk of Courts Totals	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$357,358.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,684,065.72	\$27,503.28	99%	\$2,824,462.59
	EXPENSE TOTALS	\$2,711,569.00	\$0.00	\$2,711,569.00	\$357,358.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,684,065.72	\$27,503.28	99%	\$2,824,462.59
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals											
	REVENUE TOTALS	2,711,569.00	.00	2,711,569.00	176,486.33	.00	.00	2,551,086.64	160,482.36	94%	2,528,261.76
	EXPENSE TOTALS	2,711,569.00	.00	2,711,569.00	357,358.22	.00	.00	2,684,065.72	27,503.28	99%	2,824,462.59
	Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$180,871.89)	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$132,979.08)	\$132,979.08		(\$296,200.83)
Grand Totals											
	REVENUE TOTALS	2,711,569.00	.00	2,711,569.00	176,486.33	.00	.00	2,551,086.64	160,482.36	94%	2,528,261.76
	EXPENSE TOTALS	2,711,569.00	.00	2,711,569.00	357,358.22	.00	.00	2,684,065.72	27,503.28	99%	2,824,462.59
	Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$180,871.89)	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$132,979.08)	\$132,979.08		(\$296,200.83)

	Annual Budget	YTD Actual	YTD 2016 Actual	YTD 2017 Actual	YTD Difference
Personnel Costs	\$ 1,687,330	\$ 268,331	\$ 287,661	\$ 268,331	\$ (19,330)
Operating Expenses	\$ 147,909	\$ 37,374	\$ 28,509	\$ 37,374	\$ 8,865
Interpreter Services	\$ 92,000	\$ 16,522	\$ 14,633	\$ 16,522	\$ 1,889
Attorney Fees	\$ 175,000	\$ 5,467	\$ 833	\$ 5,467	\$ 4,634
GAL - Juvenile	\$ 77,500	\$ 2,348	\$ 1,604	\$ 2,348	\$ 744
GAL - Probate	\$ 132,000	\$ 8,904	\$ 7,095	\$ 8,904	\$ 1,810
GAL - Family & Paternity	\$ 375,635	\$ 3,591	\$ 1,095	\$ 3,591	\$ 2,496
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfer Out	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 342,537	\$ 342,537	\$ 341,429	\$ 342,537	\$ 1,108
Property Tax Revenue	\$ 718,148	\$ 119,691	\$ 122,039	\$ 119,691	\$ (2,347)
Intergovernmental	\$ 175,205	\$ 88,773	\$ 86,431	\$ 88,773	\$ 2,342
Public Charges	\$ 1,145,400	\$ 187,939	\$ 217,064	\$ 187,939	\$ (29,125)
Charges & Fees - Interpreter	\$ 61,750	\$ (0)	\$ (14,559)	\$ (0)	\$ 14,559
Charges & Fees - Atty Fees	\$ 135,000	\$ 35,406	\$ 28,635	\$ 35,406	\$ 6,771
Charges & Fees - GAL Fees	\$ 440,000	\$ 78,462	\$ 81,056	\$ 78,462	\$ (2,594)
Miscellaneous Rev	\$ -	\$ (0)	\$ -	\$ (0)	\$ (0)
Interest & Investment Earnings	\$ 11,871	\$ 806	\$ 774	\$ 806	\$ 32
Transfer In	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 511,077	\$ 511,077	\$ 521,440	\$ 511,077	\$ (10,363)

YTD Difference \$180,011 \$168,539
\$ (11,471) Improvement (Decrease) From 2016 to 2017

Clerk of Courts - February 2017





For Month Ended 02/29/2016

Fiscal Year to Date 02/29/16
Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
REVENUE										
Fund 100 - General Fund										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
4100	General property taxes	732,231.00	.00	732,231.00	61,019.25	.00	122,038.50	610,192.50	17	693,570.00
4302	State grant and aid revenue	172,862.00	.00	172,862.00	.00	.00	86,431.00	86,431.00	50	162,930.50
4302	State grant and aid revenue	61,750.00	.00	61,750.00	.00	.00	(14,558.80)	76,308.80	-24	84,212.65
4302.122	State grant and aid revenue Interpreter	\$234,612.00	\$0.00	\$234,612.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$71,872.20	\$162,739.80	31%	\$247,143.15
4302 - State grant and aid revenue Totals										
4401	Licenses	600.00	.00	600.00	.00	.00	40.00	560.00	7	360.00
4401.123	Licenses Occupational	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40.00	\$560.00	7%	\$360.00
4401 - Licenses Totals										
4500	County ordinance forfeitures	250,000.00	.00	250,000.00	38,191.84	.00	60,992.66	189,007.34	24	294,631.74
4503	Penal fines for civil fees	290,000.00	.00	290,000.00	36,604.49	.00	57,996.02	232,003.98	20	280,430.54
4505	Bail forfeitures	100,000.00	.00	100,000.00	2,956.85	.00	24,099.35	75,900.65	24	69,771.74
4600	Charges and fees	185,000.00	.00	185,000.00	14,163.74	.00	26,036.22	158,963.78	14	171,918.45
4600.120	Charges and fees Clerk of court	275,000.00	.00	275,000.00	25,818.89	.00	47,899.79	227,100.21	17	258,713.27
4600.121	Charges and fees Court	170,000.00	.00	170,000.00	20,359.64	.00	28,635.18	141,364.82	17	128,337.76
4600.123	Charges and fees Attorney	430,000.00	.00	430,000.00	48,038.28	.00	81,055.64	348,944.36	19	399,536.12
4600.124	Charges and fees Guardian Ad Litem	\$1,060,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,060,000.00	\$108,380.55	\$0.00	\$183,626.83	\$876,373.17	17%	\$958,505.60
4900	Miscellaneous	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	16.00
4905	Interest	8,000.00	.00	8,000.00	774.43	.00	774.43	7,225.57	10	6,657.87
9002	Transfer in	.00	3,015.00	3,015.00	.00	.00	.00	3,015.00	0	.00
9002.200	Transfer in HR	\$0.00	\$3,015.00	\$3,015.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,015.00	0%	\$0.00
9002 - Transfer in Totals										
9002 - General Totals										
Division 001 - Clerk of Courts										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
REVENUE TOTALS										
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5100	Regular earnings	1,279,993.00	.00	1,279,993.00	84,601.93	.00	171,861.75	1,108,131.25	13	1,050,813.93
5100	Regular earnings	(52,627.00)	.00	(52,627.00)	.00	.00	.00	(52,627.00)	0	.00
5100.998	Regular earnings Budget only	\$1,227,366.00	\$0.00	\$1,227,366.00	\$84,601.93	\$0.00	\$171,861.75	\$1,055,504.25	14%	\$1,050,813.93
5100 - Regular earnings Totals										
5102	Paid leave earnings	.00	.00	.00	3,554.38	.00	7,019.75	(7,019.75)	+++	95,750.30
5102.100	Paid leave earnings Vacation	.00	.00	.00	2,632.59	.00	5,673.22	(5,673.22)	+++	17,350.02
5102.200	Paid leave earnings Personal	.00	.00	.00	1,545.91	.00	2,475.33	(2,475.33)	+++	21,005.86
5102.300	Paid leave earnings Casual time used	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	0	50.01
5102.400	Paid leave earnings Sick	.00	3,015.00	3,015.00	.00	.00	.00	3,015.00	0	50.01



For Month Ended 02/29/2016

Fiscal Year to Date 02/29/16

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund										
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5102	Paid leave earnings									
5102.500	Paid leave earnings Holiday	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	4,220.96	(4,220.96)	+++	33,844.79
5102.600	Paid leave earnings Other (funeral, jury duty, etc)	.00	.00	.00	294.90	.00	294.90	(294.90)	+++	1,717.75
	5102 - Paid leave earnings Totals	\$0.00	\$3,015.00	\$3,015.00	\$8,027.78	\$0.00	\$19,684.16	(\$16,669.16)	653%	\$169,718.73
5103	Premium									
5103.000	Premium Overtime	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	.00	.00	.00	3,000.00	0	217.92
5103.100	Premium Comp time payout	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	589.50
	5103 - Premium Totals	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	0%	\$807.42
5109	Salaries reimbursement									
5109.100	Salaries reimbursement Short term disability	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	(5,591.99)
5109.200	Salaries reimbursement IV-D	(20,000.00)	.00	(20,000.00)	(1,341.31)	.00	(2,682.62)	(17,317.38)	13	(16,095.72)
	5109 - Salaries reimbursement Totals	(\$20,000.00)	\$0.00	(\$20,000.00)	(\$1,341.31)	\$0.00	(\$2,682.62)	(17,317.38)	13%	(\$21,687.71)
5110	Fringe benefits									
5110.100	Fringe benefits FICA	94,306.00	.00	94,306.00	6,615.13	.00	13,690.02	80,615.98	15	88,053.81
5110.110	Fringe benefits Unemployment compensation	3,026.00	.00	3,026.00	202.62	.00	420.15	2,605.85	14	2,694.10
5110.200	Fringe benefits Health Insurance	299,470.00	.00	299,470.00	25,398.31	.00	62,812.62	236,657.38	21	297,202.43
5110.210	Fringe benefits Dental Insurance	28,623.00	.00	28,623.00	2,201.93	.00	5,618.83	23,004.17	20	26,086.02
5110.220	Fringe benefits Life Insurance	3,078.00	.00	3,078.00	154.23	.00	530.72	2,547.28	17	2,511.37
5110.230	Fringe benefits LT disability insurance	4,557.00	.00	4,557.00	347.92	.00	698.20	3,858.80	15	4,210.28
5110.235	Fringe benefits Disability Insurance	13,730.00	.00	13,730.00	1,144.00	.00	2,288.00	11,442.00	17	10,976.00
5110.240	Fringe benefits Workers compensation insurance	1,922.00	.00	1,922.00	160.00	.00	320.00	1,602.00	17	1,394.00
5110.300	Fringe benefits Retirement	87,890.00	.00	87,890.00	5,970.78	.00	12,419.17	75,470.83	14	82,320.79
	5110 - Fringe benefits Totals	\$536,602.00	\$0.00	\$536,602.00	\$42,194.92	\$0.00	\$98,797.71	\$437,804.29	18%	\$515,448.80
5198	Fringe benefits - Budget only	(34,425.00)	.00	(34,425.00)	.00	.00	.00	(34,425.00)	0	.00
5300	Supplies									
5300	Supplies	7,526.00	.00	7,526.00	50.00	.00	1,349.93	6,176.07	18	8,545.74
5300.001	Supplies Office	8,000.00	.00	8,000.00	650.92	.00	1,697.76	6,302.24	21	10,019.71
5300.004	Supplies Postage	33,000.00	.00	33,000.00	2,831.88	.00	8,769.47	24,230.53	27	35,232.20
	5300 - Supplies Totals	\$48,526.00	\$0.00	\$48,526.00	\$3,532.80	\$0.00	\$11,817.16	\$36,708.84	24%	\$53,797.65
5304	Printing									
5304	Printing	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	.00	.00	.00	3,000.00	0	3,146.39
5304.100	Printing Forms	800.00	.00	800.00	.00	.00	.00	800.00	0	196.61
	5304 - Printing Totals	\$3,800.00	\$0.00	\$3,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,800.00	0%	\$3,343.00
5305	Dues and memberships	300.00	.00	300.00	85.00	.00	260.00	40.00	87	430.00
5330	Books, periodicals, subscription	288.00	.00	288.00	103.35	.00	133.35	154.65	46	327.09
5340	Travel and training	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	28.97	.00	28.97	2,971.03	1	1,342.36



For Month Ended 02/29/2016

Fiscal Year to Date 02/29/16

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund											
EXPENSE											
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts											
Division 001 - General											
5410 Insurance											
5410.400	Insurance Bond	147.00	.00	147.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	147.00	0	.00
		\$147.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	0%	\$0.00
	5410 - Insurance Totals	480.00	.00	480.00	.00	.00	36.17	443.83	8	671.52	
5505	Telephone										
5601 Intra-county expense											
5601.100	Intra-county expense Technology services	8,605.00	.00	8,605.00	678.82	.00	3,324.61	5,280.39	39	7,216.76	
5601.200	Intra-county expense Insurance	9,301.00	.00	9,301.00	775.00	.00	1,550.00	7,751.00	17	10,464.00	
5601.300	Intra-county expense Other departmental	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	30.00	
5601.400	Intra-county expense Copy center	19,000.00	.00	19,000.00	4,350.60	.00	5,090.60	13,909.40	27	18,506.33	
5601.450	Intra-county expense Departmental copiers	5,760.00	.00	5,760.00	480.00	.00	960.00	4,800.00	17	4,725.00	
5601.550	Intra-county expense Document center	19,140.00	.00	19,140.00	1,444.54	.00	3,554.46	15,585.54	19	27,275.04	
	5601 - Intra-county expense Totals	\$61,806.00	\$0.00	\$61,806.00	\$7,728.96	\$0.00	\$14,479.67	\$47,326.33	23%	\$68,217.13	
5700	Contracted services	17,000.00	.00	17,000.00	658.17	.00	1,753.62	15,246.38	10	15,485.81	
5784	Interpreter services	95,000.00	.00	95,000.00	7,467.50	.00	14,633.05	80,366.95	15	99,871.71	
5785	Attorney Fees	190,000.00	.00	190,000.00	532.00	.00	833.00	189,167.00	0	166,296.31	
5787 Guardian Ad Litem											
5787.100	Guardian Ad Litem Juvenile	76,500.00	.00	76,500.00	930.00	.00	1,603.50	74,896.50	2	75,627.90	
5787.200	Guardian Ad Litem Probate	130,000.00	.00	130,000.00	3,232.90	.00	7,094.82	122,905.18	5	126,975.77	
5787.300	Guardian Ad Litem Family & Paternity	336,053.00	.00	336,053.00	560.00	.00	1,094.95	334,958.05	0	356,578.30	
	5787 - Guardian Ad Litem Totals	\$542,553.00	\$0.00	\$542,553.00	\$4,722.90	\$0.00	\$9,793.27	\$532,759.73	2%	\$559,181.97	
	Division 001 - General Totals	\$2,675,443.00	\$3,015.00	\$2,678,458.00	\$158,342.97	\$0.00	\$341,429.26	\$2,337,028.74	13%	\$2,684,065.72	
	Department 012 - Clerk of Courts Totals	\$2,675,443.00	\$3,015.00	\$2,678,458.00	\$158,342.97	\$0.00	\$341,429.26	\$2,337,028.74	13%	\$2,684,065.72	
	EXPENSE TOTALS	\$2,675,443.00	\$3,015.00	\$2,678,458.00	\$158,342.97	\$0.00	\$341,429.26	\$2,337,028.74	13%	\$2,684,065.72	
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals											
	REVENUE TOTALS	2,675,443.00	3,015.00	2,678,458.00	247,927.41	.00	521,439.99	2,157,018.01	19%	2,551,086.64	
	EXPENSE TOTALS	2,675,443.00	3,015.00	2,678,458.00	158,342.97	.00	341,429.26	2,337,028.74	13%	2,684,065.72	
	Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$89,584.44	\$0.00	\$180,010.73	(\$180,010.73)		(\$132,979.08)	
Grand Totals											
	REVENUE TOTALS	2,675,443.00	3,015.00	2,678,458.00	247,927.41	.00	521,439.99	2,157,018.01	19%	2,551,086.64	
	EXPENSE TOTALS	2,675,443.00	3,015.00	2,678,458.00	158,342.97	.00	341,429.26	2,337,028.74	13%	2,684,065.72	
	Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$89,584.44	\$0.00	\$180,010.73	(\$180,010.73)		(\$132,979.08)	



For Month Ended 02/28/2017

Fiscal Year to Date 02/28/17

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund										
REVENUE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
4100	General property taxes	718,148.00	.00	718,148.00	59,845.67	.00	119,691.34	598,456.66	17	732,231.00
4302	State grant and aid revenue	175,205.00	.00	175,205.00	.00	.00	88,773.00	86,432.00	51	175,205.00
4302	State grant and aid revenue	61,750.00	.00	61,750.00	17,070.25	.00	(.01)	61,750.01	0	59,747.75
4302.122	State grant and aid revenue Interpreter									
	4302 - State grant and aid revenue Totals	\$236,955.00	\$0.00	\$236,955.00	\$17,070.25	\$0.00	\$88,772.99	\$148,182.01	37%	\$234,952.75
4401	Licenses									
4401.123	Licenses Occupational	400.00	.00	400.00	80.00	.00	120.00	280.00	30	440.00
	4401 - Licenses Totals	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$80.00	\$0.00	\$120.00	\$280.00	30%	\$440.00
4500	County ordinance forfeitures	305,000.00	.00	305,000.00	35,273.28	.00	51,212.57	253,787.43	17	278,319.80
4503	Penal fines for civil fees	300,000.00	.00	300,000.00	30,381.19	.00	56,448.45	243,551.55	19	319,267.68
4505	Bail forfeitures	100,000.00	.00	100,000.00	3,703.08	.00	6,173.00	93,827.00	6	107,346.96
4600	Charges and fees									
4600.120	Charges and fees Clerk of court	165,000.00	.00	165,000.00	13,189.53	.00	26,112.51	138,887.49	16	161,816.98
4600.121	Charges and fees Court	275,000.00	.00	275,000.00	26,273.15	.00	47,872.72	227,127.28	17	252,516.85
4600.123	Charges and fees Attorney	135,000.00	.00	135,000.00	23,036.23	.00	35,406.11	99,593.89	26	132,796.37
4600.124	Charges and fees Guardian Ad Litem	440,000.00	.00	440,000.00	41,233.94	.00	78,461.70	361,538.30	18	400,356.40
	4600 - Charges and fees Totals	\$1,015,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,015,000.00	\$103,732.85	\$0.00	\$187,853.04	\$827,146.96	19%	\$947,486.60
4905	Interest	11,871.00	.00	11,871.00	805.93	.00	805.93	11,065.07	7	10,979.17
4990	Cash Over/Short	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	(.40)	.40	+++	189.94
9002	Transfer In									
9002.200	Transfer in HR	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	3,015.00
	9002 - Transfer in Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	+++	\$3,015.00
	9002 - Transfer in Totals	\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$250,892.25	\$0.00	\$511,076.92	\$2,176,297.08	19%	\$2,634,228.90
	Division 001 - General	\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$250,892.25	\$0.00	\$511,076.92	\$2,176,297.08	19%	\$2,634,228.90
	Department 012 - Clerk of Courts	\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$250,892.25	\$0.00	\$511,076.92	\$2,176,297.08	19%	\$2,634,228.90
	REVENUE TOTALS	\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$250,892.25	\$0.00	\$511,076.92	\$2,176,297.08	19%	\$2,634,228.90
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5100	Regular earnings									
5100	Regular earnings	1,277,513.00	.00	1,277,513.00	85,093.51	.00	169,763.18	1,107,749.82	13	1,035,509.54
5100.998	Regular earnings Budget only	(71,539.00)	.00	(71,539.00)	.00	.00	.00	(77,539.00)	0	.00
	5100 - Regular earnings Totals	\$1,199,974.00	\$0.00	\$1,199,974.00	\$85,093.51	\$0.00	\$169,763.18	\$1,030,210.82	14%	\$1,035,509.54
5102	Paid leave earnings									
5102.100	Paid leave earnings Vacation	.00	.00	.00	4,293.72	.00	5,395.15	(5,395.15)	+++	87,812.27
5102.200	Paid leave earnings Personal	.00	.00	.00	2,961.71	.00	6,564.26	(6,564.26)	+++	18,086.71
5102.300	Paid leave earnings Casual time used	.00	.00	.00	426.15	.00	981.89	(981.89)	+++	21,362.28
5102.400	Paid leave earnings Sick	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	396.32



For Month Ended 02/28/2017

Fiscal Year to Date 02/28/17
Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
EXPENSE										
Fund 100 - General Fund										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5102 Paid leave earnings										
5102.500	Paid leave earnings Holiday	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	4,331.53	(4,331.53)	+++	33,643.41
5102.600	Paid leave earnings Other (funeral, jury duty, etc)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	3,794.04
5102 - Paid leave earnings Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,681.58	\$0.00	\$17,272.83	(\$17,272.83)	+++	\$165,095.03
5103 Premium										
5103.000	Premium Overtime	3,000.00	.00	3,000.00	222.11	.00	500.25	2,499.75	17	198.64
5103.100	Premium Comp time payout	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	1,143.05
5103 - Premium Totals		\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$222.11	\$0.00	\$500.25	\$2,499.75	17%	\$1,341.69
5109 Salaries reimbursement										
5109.100	Salaries reimbursement Short term disability	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	(2,633.96)
5109.200	Salaries reimbursement IV-D	(20,000.00)	.00	(20,000.00)	(1,702.92)	.00	(3,405.84)	(16,594.16)	17	(16,095.72)
5109 - Salaries reimbursement Totals		(\$20,000.00)	\$0.00	(\$20,000.00)	(\$1,702.92)	\$0.00	(\$3,405.84)	(\$16,594.16)	17%	(\$18,729.68)
5110 Fringe benefits										
5110.100	Fringe benefits FICA	92,322.00	.00	92,322.00	6,712.14	.00	13,752.63	78,569.37	15	86,096.93
5110.110	Fringe benefits Unemployment compensation	2,357.00	.00	2,357.00	160.25	.00	323.28	2,033.72	14	2,595.17
5110.200	Fringe benefits Health Insurance	316,234.00	.00	316,234.00	24,223.53	.00	49,871.94	266,362.06	16	321,911.07
5110.210	Fringe benefits Dental Insurance	28,187.00	.00	28,187.00	2,187.28	.00	4,502.01	23,684.99	16	26,812.73
5110.220	Fringe benefits Life Insurance	2,377.00	.00	2,377.00	129.97	.00	283.24	2,093.76	12	2,102.37
5110.230	Fringe benefits LT disability insurance	6,409.00	.00	6,409.00	480.89	.00	996.83	5,412.17	16	4,100.99
5110.235	Fringe benefits Disability Insurance	9,320.00	.00	9,320.00	776.67	.00	1,553.34	7,766.66	17	13,730.00
5110.240	Fringe benefits Workers compensation insurance	2,301.00	.00	2,301.00	192.00	.00	384.00	1,917.00	17	1,922.00
5110.300	Fringe benefits Retirement	87,077.00	.00	87,077.00	6,143.84	.00	12,533.26	74,543.74	14	78,151.76
5110 - Fringe benefits Totals		\$546,584.00	\$0.00	\$546,584.00	\$41,006.57	\$0.00	\$84,200.53	\$462,383.47	15%	\$537,423.02
5198	Fringe benefits - Budget only	(42,228.00)	.00	(42,228.00)	.00	.00	.00	(42,228.00)	0	.00
5300 Supplies										
5300	Supplies	8,098.00	.00	8,098.00	63.50	.00	2,411.00	5,687.00	30	8,144.42
5300.001	Supplies Office	10,000.00	.00	10,000.00	1,034.40	.00	2,087.93	7,912.07	21	10,830.29
5300.003	Supplies Technology	10,940.00	.00	10,940.00	.00	.00	8,851.67	2,088.33	81	.00
5300.004	Supplies Postage	35,000.00	.00	35,000.00	3,555.69	.00	6,317.25	28,682.75	18	32,801.68
5300 - Supplies Totals		\$64,038.00	\$0.00	\$64,038.00	\$4,653.59	\$0.00	\$19,667.85	\$44,370.15	31%	\$51,776.39
5304 Printing										
5304	Printing	3,500.00	.00	3,500.00	.00	.00	2,812.48	687.52	80	3,157.11
5304.100	Printing Forms	250.00	.00	250.00	437.57	.00	437.57	(187.57)	175	.00
5304 - Printing Totals		\$3,750.00	\$0.00	\$3,750.00	\$437.57	\$0.00	\$3,250.05	\$499.95	87%	\$3,157.11
5305	Dues and memberships	430.00	.00	430.00	175.00	.00	215.00	215.00	50	345.00
5330	Books, periodicals, subscription	361.00	.00	361.00	72.35	.00	72.35	288.65	20	391.71
5340	Travel and training	3,600.00	.00	3,600.00	314.73	.00	314.73	3,285.27	9	4,008.88



For Month Ended 02/28/2017

Fiscal Year to Date 02/28/17

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund										
EXPENSE										
Department 012 - Clerk of Courts										
Division 001 - General										
5367	Wellness	.00	.00	.00	(240.00)	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
5410	Insurance									
5410.400	Insurance Bond	147.00	.00	147.00	.00	.00	.00	147.00	0	394.00
		\$147.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$147.00	0%	\$394.00
		436.00	.00	436.00	72.22	.00	72.22	363.78	17	436.11
5505	Telephone									
5601	Intra-county expense									
5601.100	Intra-county expense Technology services	9,383.00	.00	9,383.00	1,105.06	.00	2,378.11	7,004.89	25	8,800.21
5601.200	Intra-county expense Insurance	10,034.00	.00	10,034.00	836.00	.00	1,672.00	8,362.00	17	9,301.00
5601.400	Intra-county expense Copy center	19,000.00	.00	19,000.00	1,100.00	.00	1,762.04	17,237.96	9	17,283.70
5601.450	Intra-county expense Departmental copiers	5,760.00	.00	5,760.00	480.00	.00	960.00	4,800.00	17	5,760.00
5601.550	Intra-county expense Document center	19,140.00	.00	19,140.00	1,672.11	.00	3,590.90	15,549.10	19	13,215.74
		\$63,317.00	\$0.00	\$63,317.00	\$5,193.17	\$0.00	\$10,363.05	\$52,953.95	16%	\$54,360.65
5700	Contracted services	11,830.00	.00	11,830.00	558.47	.00	1,577.87	10,252.13	13	11,387.58
5780	Jurors	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	1,171.95	(1,171.95)	+++	.00
5784	Interpreter services	92,000.00	.00	92,000.00	9,184.25	.00	16,522.34	75,477.66	18	91,520.06
5785	Attorney Fees	175,000.00	.00	175,000.00	5,467.00	.00	5,467.00	169,533.00	3	180,262.87
5787	Guardian Ad Litem									
5787.100	Guardian Ad Litem Juvenile	77,500.00	.00	77,500.00	2,267.50	.00	2,347.50	75,152.50	3	82,287.78
5787.200	Guardian Ad Litem Probate	132,000.00	.00	132,000.00	7,255.90	.00	8,904.40	123,095.60	7	124,079.54
5787.300	Guardian Ad Litem Family & Paternity	375,635.00	.00	375,635.00	4,044.62	.00	4,260.22	371,374.78	1	369,825.84
		\$585,135.00	\$0.00	\$585,135.00	\$13,568.02	\$0.00	\$15,512.12	\$569,622.88	3%	\$576,193.16
		\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$171,757.22	\$0.00	\$342,537.48	\$2,344,836.52	13%	\$2,694,873.12
		\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$171,757.22	\$0.00	\$342,537.48	\$2,344,836.52	13%	\$2,694,873.12
		\$2,687,374.00	\$0.00	\$2,687,374.00	\$171,757.22	\$0.00	\$342,537.48	\$2,344,836.52	13%	\$2,694,873.12
		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$79,135.03	\$0.00	\$168,539.44	(\$168,539.44)		(\$60,644.22)
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals										
	REVENUE TOTALS	2,687,374.00	.00	2,687,374.00	250,892.25	.00	511,076.92	2,176,297.08	19%	2,634,228.90
	EXPENSE TOTALS	2,687,374.00	.00	2,687,374.00	171,757.22	.00	342,537.48	2,344,836.52	13%	2,694,873.12
		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$79,135.03	\$0.00	\$168,539.44	(\$168,539.44)		(\$60,644.22)
Grand Totals										
	REVENUE TOTALS	2,687,374.00	.00	2,687,374.00	250,892.25	.00	511,076.92	2,176,297.08	19%	2,634,228.90
	EXPENSE TOTALS	2,687,374.00	.00	2,687,374.00	171,757.22	.00	342,537.48	2,344,836.52	13%	2,694,873.12
		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$79,135.03	\$0.00	\$168,539.44	(\$168,539.44)		(\$60,644.22)

Form 4564 Rev. Jan. 1984	Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service INFORMATION DOCUMENT REQUEST	Request Number: 23
TO: (Name of Taxpayer and Co. Div. or Branch) Brown County Finance Department P.O. Box 23600 Green Bay, WI. 54305-3600		Subject: Follow Up to IDR No 2 & 11, 2015 Cash Disbursements Detail - Bank
Please return with listed documents to requester listed below.		ESAIN : Submitted to: Dave Ehlinger, Finance Director
		Dates of Previous Requests:

In response to IDR No 11 the County provided copies of the contractual agreements the County had entered into with two attorneys who were both subsequently hired as County employees working the County's District Attorney's Office as attorneys. In addition the County provided an explanation as to the difference in services these individual's provided the County as independent contractors and employees.

The County stated that "Brown County currently pays for two attorneys at the District Attorney's office. Of the attorney's is a full time employee on the table of organizations, the other is a contract position. That "position" is without benefits, and the person working in that role is not an employee. It's structured that way because the contract position is meant to be temporary until the State of Wisconsin finally addresses our staffing issues, and frankly because it's cheaper than hiring a full-time employee. Kari Hoffman had worked in the contract position until the attorney who was working as a Brown County employee separated employment with the County. At that time we terminated the contract with Kari and she became an employee. We then contract with Bryant Dorsey for the remainder of 2015 and into 2016. In 2016 Bryant became an employee and we then began contracting with Caleb Saunders until Caleb Saunders became an employee and we began contracting with Kim Hardtke. We've had a bit of musical chairs over here, but we kind of use that contract "position" to see if an attorney might be a good fit for employment and we tend to hire the person when a position opens."

A review of the contracts provided indicated that the each of the above notated individual's created an LLC. The Independent contractor agreement states that the County was to provide space in the District Attorney's Office so the contractor has access to state records to assist in the performance of the special prosecutor duties. The contract clearly states that the contractual relationship between the Contractor and the County was that of an Independent Contractor for the services the Contractor provides the County.

Based on the information provided to this point it appears the County is using the Contractor position in question to work with the Contractor to determine if the Contractor would be a "good fit" for actual employment with Brown County. As the County has also stated usage of the Contractor position is cheaper than hiring employee.

None of these factors would on their own qualify the County to classify the Contractor position as an independent contract vs the services these same individual's provided the County when they terminated their independent contract agreements with the County and began working with the County as employees. On the surface it appears the County has the right to direct and control the activities of the Contractor who is providing special prosecutor duties. It hard to envision a situation whereby an independent contractor could under their own control make decisions with no direction and control from the County as special prosecutors in the District Attorney's office.

1. Please provide a listing of all the factors the County used in making the determination that the individual's in question were independent contractor for employment tax purposes when providing special prosecutor duties to the county under their independent contractor agreements.

Provide by: April 21, 2017		
From:	Name and Title of Requester: David Rasmussen, Internal Revenue Agent, Badge No 39-00923	Date: April 4, 2017
	IRS P.O. Box 1644 Waukesha, WI. 53187	

Form 4564

Department of the Treasury -- Internal Revenue Service

Form 4564 Rev. Jan. 1984	Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service INFORMATION DOCUMENT REQUEST	Request Number: 23
TO: (Name of Taxpayer and Co. Div. or Branch) Brown County Finance Department P.O. Box 23600 Green Bay, WI. 54305-3600 Please return with listed documents to requester listed below.		Subject: Follow Up to IDR No 2 & 11, 2015 Cash Disbursements Detail - Bank
		ESAIN : Submitted to: Dave Ehlinger, Finance Director
		Dates of Previous Requests:

2. Please notate specifically all the duties the special prosecutors provided as independent contractors that would show that the County did not have the right to direct and control the activities of these individuals for the services they provided the County under their independent contractor agreement.

3. Please provide the employment position description for the position that Kari Hoffman accepted as an employee of Brown County in the District Attorney's office for the services she provided as a county employee.

Provide by: April 21, 2017		
From:	Name and Title of Requester: David Rasmussen, Internal Revenue Agent, Badge No 39-00923	Date: April 4, 2017
	IRS P.O. Box 1644 Waukesha, WI. 53187	

Form 4564

Department of the Treasury – Internal Revenue Service

FAX

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Confidentiality Notice

This communication is intended for the sole use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent for delivering the communication to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication may be strictly prohibited.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone call and return the communication to the fax number you will be given, then destroy the document(s). Thank you!



Date:

4/04/17

Number of pages including cover sheet:

11

To: Dave Ehlinger

Re:

FROM:

David Resnais
Internal Revenue Service
N12 W24200 Tower Place
Suite 202
Waukegan WI 53188

Phone:

Fax Phone: 920-448-4036

Phone:

262-513-3424

Fax Phone:

(262) 513-3512

cc:

REMARKS:



Urgent



For your review



Reply ASAP



Please Comment

See attached IDR's 22 + 23

Also please provide an update on status
of IDR's 6 + 7.


Brown County
Public Safety Communications
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

****PRELIMINARY****

	12/31/2016	
	Annual	YTD
	Budget	Actual
Personnel Costs	\$ 4,607,160.00	\$ 4,714,294.26
Operating Expenses	\$ 1,739,279.00	\$ 1,573,252.39
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$ 6,336,769.00	\$ 6,336,769.00
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 5,670.00	\$ 12,155.95
Public Charges	\$ -	\$ 3,534.25
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 13.50
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Public Safety Communications - December 31, 2016





**** UNAUDITED ****

**** PRELIMINARY ****

Public Safety Communications

Through 12/31/16
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

Account Classification		Fund 100 - General Fund		Adopted Budget		Budget Amendments		Amended Budget		Current Month Transactions		Encumbrances		YTD Transactions		YTD Budget - YTD Transactions		% Used/Rec'd		Prior Year YTD	
REVENUE																					
Property taxes		6,336,769.00		.00		.00		6,336,769.00		528,064.12		.00		6,336,769.00		.00		100		5,917,672.00	
Intergov Revenue		5,670.00		.00		.00		5,670.00		2,294.43		.00		12,155.95		(6,485.95)		214		11,111.82	
Public Charges		.00		.00		.00		.00		270.00		.00		3,534.25		(3,534.25)		+++		58,512.46	
Miscellaneous Revenue		4,000.00		.00		.00		4,000.00		13.50		.00		13.50		3,986.50		0		7,817.30	
Other Financing Sources		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		+++		.00	
REVENUE TOTALS		\$6,346,439.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$6,346,439.00		\$530,642.05		\$0.00		\$6,352,472.70		(\$6,033.70)		100%		\$5,995,113.58	
EXPENSE																					
Personnel Costs		4,607,160.00		.00		.00		4,607,160.00		617,185.23		.00		4,714,294.26		(107,134.26)		102		4,627,034.00	
Operating Expenses		1,739,279.00		.00		.00		1,739,279.00		70,257.65		.00		1,573,252.39		166,026.61		90		1,278,161.11	
Outlay		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		.00		+++		.00	
EXPENSE TOTALS		\$6,346,439.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$6,346,439.00		\$687,442.88		\$0.00		\$6,287,546.65		\$58,892.35		99%		\$5,905,195.11	
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals																					
REVENUE TOTALS		6,346,439.00		.00		.00		6,346,439.00		530,642.05		.00		6,352,472.70		(6,033.70)		100%		5,995,113.58	
EXPENSE TOTALS		6,346,439.00		.00		.00		6,346,439.00		687,442.88		.00		6,287,546.65		58,892.35		99%		5,905,195.11	
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		(\$156,800.83)		\$0.00		\$64,926.05		(\$64,926.05)				\$89,918.47	
Grand Totals																					
REVENUE TOTALS		6,346,439.00		.00		.00		6,346,439.00		530,642.05		.00		6,352,472.70		(6,033.70)		100%		5,995,113.58	
EXPENSE TOTALS		6,346,439.00		.00		.00		6,346,439.00		687,442.88		.00		6,287,546.65		58,892.35		99%		5,905,195.11	
Grand Totals		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		(\$156,800.83)		\$0.00		\$64,926.05		(\$64,926.05)				\$89,918.47	


16

Brown County
Public Safety Communications
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

	1/31/2017	
	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Personnel Costs	\$4,807,489.00	\$ 373,009.15
Operating Expenses	\$1,896,298.00	\$ 193,568.56
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$6,694,027.00	\$ 557,835.58
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 2,879.74
Public Charges	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 450.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Public Safety Communications - January 31, 2017





PSC
Through 01/31/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

****UNAUDITED****


Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	6,694,027.00	.00	6,694,027.00	557,835.58	.00	557,835.58	6,136,191.42	8	528,064.08
Intergov Revenue	5,760.00	.00	5,760.00	2,879.74	.00	2,879.74	2,880.26	50	.00
Public Charges	4,000.00	.00	4,000.00	450.00	.00	450.00	3,550.00	11	324.25
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$6,703,787.00	\$0.00	\$6,703,787.00	\$561,165.32	\$0.00	\$561,165.32	\$6,142,621.68	8%	\$528,388.33
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	4,807,489.00	.00	4,807,489.00	373,009.15	.00	373,009.15	4,434,479.85	8	427,527.13
Operating Expenses	1,896,298.00	.00	1,896,298.00	193,568.56	774,302.40	193,568.56	928,427.04	51	326,203.16
Outlay	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$6,703,787.00	\$0.00	\$6,703,787.00	\$566,577.71	\$774,302.40	\$566,577.71	\$5,362,906.89	20%	\$753,730.29
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	561,165.32	.00	561,165.32	6,142,621.68	8%	528,388.33
EXPENSE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	566,577.71	774,302.40	566,577.71	5,362,906.89	20%	753,730.29
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$5,412.39)	(\$774,302.40)	(\$5,412.39)	\$779,714.79		(\$225,341.96)
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	561,165.32	.00	561,165.32	6,142,621.68	8%	528,388.33
EXPENSE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	566,577.71	774,302.40	566,577.71	5,362,906.89	20%	753,730.29
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$5,412.39)	(\$774,302.40)	(\$5,412.39)	\$779,714.79		(\$225,341.96)

Brown County
Public Safety Communications
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

	2/28/2017	
	Annual	YTD
	Budget	Actual
Personnel Costs	\$4,807,489.00	\$ 730,817.53
Operating Expenses	\$1,896,298.00	\$ 1,126,208.50
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$6,694,027.00	\$ 1,115,671.16
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 2,702.66
Public Charges	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 810.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Public Safety Communications - February 28, 2017





PSC
Through 02/28/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

****UNAUDITED****


Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	6,694,027.00	.00	6,694,027.00	557,835.58	.00	1,115,671.16	5,578,355.84	17	1,056,128.16
Intergov Revenue	5,760.00	.00	5,760.00	(177.08)	.00	2,702.66	3,057.34	47	30.00
Public Charges	4,000.00	.00	4,000.00	360.00	.00	810.00	3,190.00	20	744.25
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$6,703,787.00	\$0.00	\$6,703,787.00	\$558,018.50	\$0.00	\$1,119,183.82	\$5,584,603.18	17%	\$1,056,902.41
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	4,807,489.00	.00	4,807,489.00	357,808.38	.00	730,817.53	4,076,671.47	15	785,409.46
Operating Expenses	1,896,298.00	.00	1,896,298.00	932,639.94	7,771.66	1,126,208.50	762,317.84	60	372,607.18
Outlay	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$6,703,787.00	\$0.00	\$6,703,787.00	\$1,290,448.32	\$7,771.66	\$1,857,026.03	\$4,838,989.31	28%	\$1,158,016.64
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	558,018.50	.00	1,119,183.82	5,584,603.18	17%	1,056,902.41
EXPENSE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	1,290,448.32	7,771.66	1,857,026.03	4,838,989.31	28%	1,158,016.64
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$732,429.82)	(\$7,771.66)	(\$737,842.21)	\$745,613.87		(\$101,114.23)
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	558,018.50	.00	1,119,183.82	5,584,603.18	17%	1,056,902.41
EXPENSE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	.00	6,703,787.00	1,290,448.32	7,771.66	1,857,026.03	4,838,989.31	28%	1,158,016.64
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$732,429.82)	(\$7,771.66)	(\$737,842.21)	\$745,613.87		(\$101,114.23)

Brown County
Public Safety Communications
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

	3/31/2017	
	Annual	YTD
	Budget	Actual
Personnel Costs	\$4,807,489.00	\$ 1,061,245.85
Operating Expenses	\$1,896,298.00	\$ 1,206,637.50
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$6,694,027.00	\$ 1,673,506.74
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 3,940.60
Public Charges	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 1,120.75
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 2,700.00

Public Safety Communications - March 31, 2017





**** UNAUDITED ****

PSC

Through 03/31/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property Taxes	6,694,027.00	.00	6,694,027.00	557,835.58	.00	1,673,506.74	5,020,520.26	25	1,584,192.24
Intergov Revenue	5,760.00	.00	5,760.00	1,237.94	.00	3,940.60	1,819.40	68	655.61
Public Charges	4,000.00	.00	4,000.00	310.75	.00	1,120.75	2,879.25	28	984.25
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	2,700.00	2,700.00	2,700.00	.00	2,700.00	.00	100	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$6,703,787.00	\$2,700.00	\$6,706,487.00	\$562,084.27	\$0.00	\$1,681,268.09	\$5,025,218.91	25%	\$1,585,832.10
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	4,807,489.00	.00	4,807,489.00	330,428.32	.00	1,061,245.85	3,746,243.15	22	1,146,918.45
Operating Expenses	1,896,298.00	2,700.00	1,898,998.00	80,429.00	5,463.66	1,206,637.50	686,896.84	64	1,105,790.63
Outlay	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$6,703,787.00	\$2,700.00	\$6,706,487.00	\$410,857.32	\$5,463.66	\$2,267,883.35	\$4,433,139.99	34%	\$2,252,709.08
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	2,700.00	6,706,487.00	562,084.27	.00	1,681,268.09	5,025,218.91	25%	1,585,832.10
EXPENSE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	2,700.00	6,706,487.00	410,857.32	5,463.66	2,267,883.35	4,433,139.99	34%	2,252,709.08
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$151,226.95	(\$5,463.66)	(\$586,615.26)	\$592,078.92		(\$666,876.98)
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	2,700.00	6,706,487.00	562,084.27	.00	1,681,268.09	5,025,218.91	25%	1,585,832.10
EXPENSE TOTALS	6,703,787.00	2,700.00	6,706,487.00	410,857.32	5,463.66	2,267,883.35	4,433,139.99	34%	2,252,709.08
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$151,226.95	(\$5,463.66)	(\$586,615.26)	\$592,078.92		(\$666,876.98)


Brown County
Emergency Management
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

****PRELIMINARY****

	12/31/2016	
	Annual	YTD
	Budget	Actual
Personnel Costs	\$ 142,164.00	\$ 133,095.52
Operating Expenses	\$ 99,275.00	\$ 93,057.45
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$ 62,794.00	\$ 62,794.00
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 178,645.00	\$ 176,383.63
Public Charges	\$ -	\$ -
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Emergency Management - December 31, 2016





**** UNAUDITED ****

**** PRELIMINARY ****

Emergency Management

Through 12/31/16
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing


Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	62,794.00	.00	62,794.00	5,232.87	.00	62,794.00	.00	100	49,955.00
Intergov Revenue	178,645.00	.00	178,645.00	26,874.87	.00	176,383.63	2,261.37	99	156,705.03
Public Charges	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	29.95
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	318.99
Other Financing Sources	25,000.00	(25,000.00)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$266,439.00	(\$25,000.00)	\$241,439.00	\$32,107.74	\$0.00	\$239,177.63	\$2,261.37	99%	\$207,008.97
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	142,164.00	.00	142,164.00	19,212.73	.00	133,095.52	9,068.48	94	117,078.58
Operating Expenses	99,275.00	.00	99,275.00	11,934.38	.00	93,057.45	6,217.55	94	76,523.52
Outlay	25,000.00	(25,000.00)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$266,439.00	(\$25,000.00)	\$241,439.00	\$31,147.11	\$0.00	\$226,152.97	\$15,286.03	94%	\$193,602.10
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	266,439.00	(25,000.00)	241,439.00	32,107.74	.00	239,177.63	2,261.37	99%	207,008.97
EXPENSE TOTALS	266,439.00	(25,000.00)	241,439.00	31,147.11	.00	226,152.97	15,286.03	94%	193,602.10
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$960.63	\$0.00	\$13,024.66	(\$13,024.66)		\$13,406.87
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	266,439.00	(25,000.00)	241,439.00	32,107.74	.00	239,177.63	2,261.37	99%	207,008.97
EXPENSE TOTALS	266,439.00	(25,000.00)	241,439.00	31,147.11	.00	226,152.97	15,286.03	94%	193,602.10
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$960.63	\$0.00	\$13,024.66	(\$13,024.66)		\$13,406.87

Brown County
Emergency Management
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

	1/31/2017	
	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Personnel Costs	\$ 165,053.00	\$ 12,920.81
Operating Expenses	\$ 115,207.00	\$ 18,248.39
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$ 83,203.00	\$ 6,933.58
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 197,057.00	\$ -
Public Charges	\$ -	\$ -
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Emergency Management - January 31, 2017





****UNAUDITED****

Emergency Management

Through 01/31/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing


Account Classification	Fund	100 - General Fund	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
REVENUE												
Property taxes		83,203.00	.00	.00	83,203.00	6,933.58	.00	.00	6,933.58	76,269.42	8	5,232.83
Intergov Revenue		197,057.00	.00	.00	197,057.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	197,057.00	0	17,536.25
Public Charges		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Miscellaneous Revenue		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS		\$280,260.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$280,260.00	\$6,933.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,933.58	\$273,326.42	2%	\$22,769.08
EXPENSE												
Personnel Costs		165,053.00	.00	.00	165,053.00	12,920.81	.00	.00	12,920.81	152,132.19	8	12,663.49
Operating Expenses		115,207.00	.00	.00	115,207.00	18,248.39	.00	.00	18,248.39	96,958.61	16	10,752.56
Outlay		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS		\$280,260.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$280,260.00	\$31,169.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$31,169.20	\$249,090.80	11%	\$23,416.05
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals												
REVENUE TOTALS		280,260.00	.00	.00	280,260.00	6,933.58	.00	.00	6,933.58	273,326.42	2%	22,769.08
EXPENSE TOTALS		280,260.00	.00	.00	280,260.00	31,169.20	.00	.00	31,169.20	249,090.80	11%	23,416.05
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$24,235.62)	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$24,235.62)	\$24,235.62		(\$646.97)
Grand Totals												
REVENUE TOTALS		280,260.00	.00	.00	280,260.00	6,933.58	.00	.00	6,933.58	273,326.42	2%	22,769.08
EXPENSE TOTALS		280,260.00	.00	.00	280,260.00	31,169.20	.00	.00	31,169.20	249,090.80	11%	23,416.05
Grand Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$24,235.62)	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$24,235.62)	\$24,235.62		(\$646.97)

Brown County
Emergency Management
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

	2/28/2017	
	Annual	YTD
	Budget	Actual
Personnel Costs	\$ 165,053.00	\$ 25,941.44
Operating Expenses	\$ 115,207.00	\$ 24,644.88
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$ 83,203.00	\$ 13,867.16
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 197,057.00	\$ 37,077.27
Public Charges	\$ -	\$ -
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Emergency Management - February 28, 2017





****UNAUDITED****

Emergency Management

Through 02/28/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing


Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	83,203.00	.00	83,203.00	6,933.58	.00	13,867.16	69,335.84	17	10,465.66
Intergov Revenue	197,057.00	.00	197,057.00	37,077.27	.00	37,077.27	159,979.73	19	17,536.25
Public Charges	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$280,260.00	\$0.00	\$280,260.00	\$44,010.85	\$0.00	\$50,944.43	\$229,315.57	18%	\$28,001.91
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	165,053.00	.00	165,053.00	13,020.63	.00	25,941.44	139,111.56	16	24,048.12
Operating Expenses	115,207.00	.00	115,207.00	6,396.49	.00	24,644.88	90,562.12	21	14,239.46
Outlay	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$280,260.00	\$0.00	\$280,260.00	\$19,417.12	\$0.00	\$50,586.32	\$229,673.68	18%	\$38,287.58
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	44,010.85	.00	50,944.43	229,315.57	18%	28,001.91
EXPENSE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	19,417.12	.00	50,586.32	229,673.68	18%	38,287.58
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,593.73	\$0.00	\$358.11	(\$358.11)		(\$10,285.67)
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	44,010.85	.00	50,944.43	229,315.57	18%	28,001.91
EXPENSE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	19,417.12	.00	50,586.32	229,673.68	18%	38,287.58
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,593.73	\$0.00	\$358.11	(\$358.11)		(\$10,285.67)

Brown County
Emergency Management
Budget Status Report

****UNAUDITED****

	3/31/2017	
	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Personnel Costs	\$ 165,053.00	\$ 37,962.41
Operating Expenses	\$ 115,207.00	\$ 41,239.41
Outlay	\$ -	\$ -
Property Taxes	\$ 83,203.00	\$ 20,800.74
Intergovernmental Revenue	\$ 197,057.00	\$ 60,330.90
Public Charges	\$ -	\$ -
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financing Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Emergency Management - March 31, 2017





****UNAUDITED****

Emergency Management

Through 03/31/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	83,203.00	.00	83,203.00	6,933.58	.00	20,800.74	62,402.26	25	15,698.49
Intergov Revenue	197,057.00	.00	197,057.00	23,253.63	.00	60,330.90	136,726.10	31	44,794.69
Public Charges	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$280,260.00	\$0.00	\$280,260.00	\$30,187.21	\$0.00	\$81,131.64	\$199,128.36	29%	\$60,483.18
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	165,053.00	.00	165,053.00	12,020.97	.00	37,962.41	127,090.59	23	35,449.59
Operating Expenses	115,207.00	.00	115,207.00	16,594.53	.00	41,239.41	73,967.59	36	22,341.03
Outlay	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$280,260.00	\$0.00	\$280,260.00	\$28,615.50	\$0.00	\$79,201.82	\$201,058.18	28%	\$57,790.62
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	30,187.21	.00	81,131.64	199,128.36	29%	60,483.18
EXPENSE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	28,615.50	.00	79,201.82	201,058.18	28%	57,790.62
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,571.71	\$0.00	\$1,929.82	(\$1,929.82)		\$2,692.56
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	30,187.21	.00	81,131.64	199,128.36	29%	60,483.18
EXPENSE TOTALS	280,260.00	.00	280,260.00	28,615.50	.00	79,201.82	201,058.18	28%	57,790.62
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,571.71	\$0.00	\$1,929.82	(\$1,929.82)		\$2,692.56

BUDGET STATUS REPORT

Brown County
Medical Examiner
Budget Status Report


	Amended Annual Budget	YTD Actual	% Used/ Received
Personnel Costs	290,044	57,589	19.9%
Operating Expenses	900,698	30,626	3.4%
Property Taxes	476,487	79,415	16.7%
Intergovernmental Revenue	87,120	14,520	16.7%
Public Charges	627,135	91,680	14.6%

HIGHLIGHTS:
Expenses:

Revenues:

Medical Examiner - February 2016 (Unaudited)

■ Amended Annual Budget
□ YTD Actual





Budget by Account Classification Report - Med. Exam (Unaudited)

Through 02/28/17

Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included

Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month		YTD	YTD		Rec'd	Prior Year Total
				Transactions	Encumbrances		Transactions	Transactions		
Fund 100 - General Fund										
REVENUE										
Property taxes	476,487.00	.00	476,487.00	39,707.25	.00	.00	79,414.50	397,072.50	17	308,757.00
Intergov Revenue	87,120.00	.00	87,120.00	7,260.00	.00	.00	14,520.00	72,600.00	17	108,286.02
Public Charges	627,135.00	.00	627,135.00	46,040.00	.00	.00	91,680.00	535,455.00	15	509,424.25
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	15,000.00	.00	15,000.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	15,000.00	0	1,197.79
REVENUE TOTALS	\$1,205,742.00	\$0.00	\$1,205,742.00	\$93,007.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$185,614.50	\$1,020,127.50	15%	\$927,665.06
EXPENSE										
Personnel Costs	290,044.00	.00	290,044.00	30,695.23	.00	.00	57,589.49	232,454.51	20	319,356.74
Operating Expenses	900,698.00	.00	900,698.00	13,876.71	.00	.00	30,625.84	870,072.16	3	809,011.94
Outlay	15,000.00	.00	15,000.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	15,000.00	0	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$1,205,742.00	\$0.00	\$1,205,742.00	\$44,571.94	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$88,215.33	\$1,117,526.67	7%	\$1,128,368.68
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS	1,205,742.00	.00	1,205,742.00	93,007.25	.00	.00	185,614.50	1,020,127.50	15%	927,665.06
EXPENSE TOTALS	1,205,742.00	.00	1,205,742.00	44,571.94	.00	.00	88,215.33	1,117,526.67	7%	1,128,368.68
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$48,435.31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$97,399.17	(\$97,399.17)		(\$200,703.62)
Grand Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS	1,205,742.00	.00	1,205,742.00	93,007.25	.00	.00	185,614.50	1,020,127.50	15%	927,665.06
EXPENSE TOTALS	1,205,742.00	.00	1,205,742.00	44,571.94	.00	.00	88,215.33	1,117,526.67	7%	1,128,368.68
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$48,435.31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$97,399.17	(\$97,399.17)		(\$200,703.62)

2017 Brown County Medical Examiner Activity Spreadsheet

	Investigations	Autopsy	External	Cremations	Suicides	Homicides	MVA	Other Acc	Natural	Undet	Pending
January	67	14	0	119	2	0	4	9	26	0	6
February	63	16	0	110	1	1	0	4	21	0	4
March	51	11	0	90	3	0	1	8	37	0	2
April											
May											
June											
July											
August											
September											
October											
November											
December											
Totals	181	41	0	319	6	1	5	21	84	0	12

Previous Years	Investigations	Autopsy	External	Cremations	Suicides	Homicides	MVA	Other Acc	Natural	Undet	Pending	Hospice
End of March 2016	176	40	1	336	9	0	4	11	140	0	0	-
End of March 2015	256	13	7	302	7	1	4	30	217	0	0	193

Previous Years	Investigations	Autopsy	External	Cremations	Suicides	Homicides	MVA	Other Acc	Natural	Undet	Pending	Hospice
2016 Totals	640	164	14	1226	46	8	17	42	469	0	0	-
2015 Totals	1096	69	42	1160	37	5	18	70	965	0	0	604


Brown County


Circuit Courts 1-8, Court Commissioners, Register in Probate

Budget Status Report - January 2017

	Amended Budget	YTD Transactions
Personnel Services	\$ 1,620,090	\$ 122,468
Operating Expenses	\$ 1,258,883	\$ 98,792
Outlay	\$ 58,015	\$ 38,193
Property Taxes	\$ 2,080,509	\$ 173,376
Intergovernmental	\$ 718,464	\$ 360,227
Charges for Sales & Services	\$ 80,000	\$ 7,854
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financial Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Circuit Courts, Commissioners, Probate - JANUARY 2017





Courts/Comm/Probate (January 2017)

Through 01/31/17

Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included

Summary Listing

Fund 100 - General Fund									
Account Classification									
	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
REVENUE									
Property taxes	2,080,509.00	.00	2,080,509.00	173,375.75	.00	173,375.75	1,907,133.25	8	173,267.00
Intergov Revenue	718,464.00	.00	718,464.00	360,227.00	.00	360,227.00	358,237.00	50	359,232.00
Public Charges	80,000.00	.00	80,000.00	7,854.04	.00	7,854.04	72,145.96	10	7,802.90
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	58,015.00	.00	58,015.00	.00	.00	.00	58,015.00	0	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$2,936,988.00	\$0.00	\$2,936,988.00	\$541,456.79	\$0.00	\$541,456.79	\$2,395,531.21	18%	\$540,301.90
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	1,620,090.00	.00	1,620,090.00	122,468.08	.00	122,468.08	1,497,621.92	8	136,303.98
Operating Expenses	1,258,883.00	.00	1,258,883.00	98,791.86	10,285.00	98,791.86	1,149,806.14	9	121,639.56
Outlay	58,015.00	.00	58,015.00	38,193.00	30,185.25	38,193.00	(10,363.25)	118	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$2,936,988.00	\$0.00	\$2,936,988.00	\$259,452.94	\$40,470.25	\$259,452.94	\$2,637,064.81	10%	\$257,943.54
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	541,456.79	.00	541,456.79	2,395,531.21	18%	540,301.90
EXPENSE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	259,452.94	40,470.25	259,452.94	2,637,064.81	10%	257,943.54
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$282,003.85	(\$40,470.25)	\$282,003.85	(\$241,533.60)		\$282,358.36
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	541,456.79	.00	541,456.79	2,395,531.21	18%	540,301.90
EXPENSE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	259,452.94	40,470.25	259,452.94	2,637,064.81	10%	257,943.54
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$282,003.85	(\$40,470.25)	\$282,003.85	(\$241,533.60)		\$282,358.36


Brown County

Circuit Courts 1-8, Court Commissioners, Register in Probate

Budget Status Report - February 2017

	Amended Budget	YTD Transactions
Personnel Services	\$ 1,620,090	\$ 245,309
Operating Expenses	\$ 1,258,883	\$ 208,071
Outlay	\$ 58,015	\$ 41,699
Property Taxes	\$ 2,080,509	\$ 346,752
Intergovernmental	\$ 718,464	\$ 360,227
Charges for Sales & Services	\$ 80,000	\$ 16,605
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financial Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Circuit Courts, Commissioners, Probate - FEBRUARY 2017





Courts/Comm/Probate (February 2017)

Through 02/28/17

Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included

Summary Listing

Account Classification									
Fund 100 - General Fund									
	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
REVENUE									
Property taxes	2,080,509.00	.00	2,080,509.00	173,375.75	.00	346,751.50	1,733,757.50	17	346,534.00
Intergov Revenue	718,464.00	.00	718,464.00	.00	.00	360,227.00	358,237.00	50	359,232.00
Public Charges	80,000.00	.00	80,000.00	8,750.56	.00	16,604.60	63,395.40	21	7,802.90
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	58,015.00	.00	58,015.00	.00	.00	.00	58,015.00	0	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$2,936,988.00	\$0.00	\$2,936,988.00	\$182,126.31	\$0.00	\$723,583.10	\$2,213,404.90	25%	\$713,568.90
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	1,620,090.00	.00	1,620,090.00	122,840.93	.00	245,309.01	1,374,780.99	15	264,766.69
Operating Expenses	1,258,883.00	.00	1,258,883.00	109,278.74	630.00	208,070.60	1,050,182.40	17	187,608.64
Outlay	58,015.00	.00	58,015.00	3,506.25	26,679.00	41,699.25	(10,363.25)	118	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$2,936,988.00	\$0.00	\$2,936,988.00	\$235,625.92	\$27,309.00	\$495,078.86	\$2,414,600.14	18%	\$452,375.33
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	182,126.31	.00	723,583.10	2,213,404.90	25%	713,568.90
EXPENSE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	235,625.92	27,309.00	495,078.86	2,414,600.14	18%	452,375.33
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$53,499.61)	(\$27,309.00)	\$228,504.24	(\$201,195.24)		\$261,193.57
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	182,126.31	.00	723,583.10	2,213,404.90	25%	713,568.90
EXPENSE TOTALS	2,936,988.00	.00	2,936,988.00	235,625.92	27,309.00	495,078.86	2,414,600.14	18%	452,375.33
Grand Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$53,499.61)	(\$27,309.00)	\$228,504.24	(\$201,195.24)		\$261,193.57


Brown County

Circuit Courts 1-3, Court Commissioners, Register in Probate

Budget Status Report - March 2017

	Amended Budget	YTD Transactions
Personnel Services	\$ 1,620,090	\$ 356,293
Operating Expenses	\$ 1,258,883	\$ 326,440
Outlay	\$ 58,015	\$ 47,939
Property Taxes	\$ 2,080,509	\$ 520,127
Intergovernmental	\$ 718,464	\$ 360,227
Charges for Sales & Services	\$ 80,000	\$ 24,662
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Other Financial Sources	\$ -	\$ -

Circuit Courts, Commissioners, Probate - MARCH 2017





Courts/Comm/Probate (March 2017)

Through 03/31/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

Fund 100 - General Fund									
Account Classification									
	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/Rec'd	Prior Year YTD
REVENUE									
Property taxes	2,080,509.00	.00	2,080,509.00	173,375.75	.00	520,127.25	1,560,381.75	25	519,801.00
Intergov Revenue	718,464.00	.00	718,464.00	.00	.00	360,227.00	358,237.00	50	359,232.00
Public Charges	80,000.00	.00	80,000.00	8,057.56	.00	24,662.16	55,337.84	31	20,190.67
Miscellaneous Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Other Financing Sources	58,015.00	53,000.00	111,015.00	53,000.00	.00	53,000.00	58,015.00	48	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$2,936,988.00	\$53,000.00	\$2,989,988.00	\$234,433.31	\$0.00	\$958,016.41	\$2,031,971.59	32%	\$899,223.67
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	1,620,090.00	.00	1,620,090.00	110,983.63	.00	356,292.64	1,263,797.36	22	375,122.97
Operating Expenses	1,258,883.00	.00	1,258,883.00	118,369.74	630.00	326,440.34	931,812.66	26	295,677.08
Outlay	58,015.00	53,000.00	111,015.00	6,239.94	33,841.00	47,939.19	29,234.81	74	.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$2,936,988.00	\$53,000.00	\$2,989,988.00	\$235,593.31	\$34,471.00	\$730,672.17	\$2,224,844.83	26%	\$670,800.05
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	REVENUE TOTALS	53,000.00	2,989,988.00	234,433.31	.00	958,016.41	2,031,971.59	32%	899,223.67
	EXPENSE TOTALS	53,000.00	2,989,988.00	235,593.31	34,471.00	730,672.17	2,224,844.83	26%	670,800.05
	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$1,160.00)	(\$34,471.00)	\$227,344.24	(\$192,873.24)		\$228,423.62
Grand Totals	REVENUE TOTALS	53,000.00	2,989,988.00	234,433.31	.00	958,016.41	2,031,971.59	32%	899,223.67
	EXPENSE TOTALS	53,000.00	2,989,988.00	235,593.31	34,471.00	730,672.17	2,224,844.83	26%	670,800.05
	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$1,160.00)	(\$34,471.00)	\$227,344.24	(\$192,873.24)		\$228,423.62

18

BUDGET STATUS REPORT - UNAUDITED

Brown County
Sheriff's Office
Budget Status Report

	Amended Annual Budget	YTD Actual	% Used/ Received
Personnel Costs	28,998,893	4,690,680	16%
Operating Expenses	8,940,304	1,664,362	19%
Outlay	312,224	-	0%
Property Taxes	29,063,107	4,843,851	17%
Intergovernmental Revenue	6,710,659	969,464	14%
Public Charges	1,913,662	281,944	15%
Miscellaneous Revenue	435,339	31,176	7%
Other Financing Sources	128,653	58,653	46%

Incl. Sheriff's Office and DARE fund combined


HIGHLIGHTS:


Expenses: Overall expenses through February were at 17% of budget, which is roughly what would be expected through two months.

Revenues: Overall revenues through February were 16% of budget, which is roughly what would be expected through two months. Typically many revenues are earned later in the year.

Sheriff's Office -
Feb., 2017

Amended Annual Budget YTD Actual





Sheriff - Budget by Account Classification

Through 02/28/17
Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included
Summary Listing

Account Classification	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 100 - General Fund									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	29,063,107.00	.00	29,063,107.00	2,421,925.57	.00	4,843,851.14	24,219,255.86	17	28,172,763.00
Intergov Revenue	6,690,659.00	22,000.00	6,712,659.00	851,388.62	.00	969,544.16	5,743,114.84	14	6,700,557.87
Public Charges	1,913,662.00	.00	1,913,662.00	173,388.70	.00	281,943.72	1,631,718.28	15	1,978,838.33
Miscellaneous Revenue	240,062.00	.00	240,062.00	17,942.49	.00	31,176.23	208,885.77	13	308,722.79
Other Financing Sources	70,000.00	113,515.00	183,515.00	.00	.00	58,653.00	124,862.00	32	945,348.39
REVENUE TOTALS	\$37,977,490.00	\$135,515.00	\$38,113,005.00	\$3,464,645.38	\$0.00	\$6,185,168.25	\$31,927,836.75	16%	\$38,106,230.38
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	28,754,422.00	113,516.00	28,867,938.00	2,263,733.58	.00	4,675,745.81	24,192,192.19	16	29,138,457.03
Operating Expenses	8,910,844.00	22,000.00	8,932,844.00	671,940.57	(36.00)	1,663,883.97	7,268,996.03	19	8,336,391.48
Outlay	312,224.00	.00	312,224.00	.00	.00	.00	312,224.00	0	577,397.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$37,977,490.00	\$135,516.00	\$38,113,006.00	\$2,935,674.15	(\$36.00)	\$6,339,629.78	\$31,773,412.22	17%	\$38,052,245.51
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	37,977,490.00	135,515.00	38,113,005.00	3,464,645.38	.00	6,185,168.25	31,927,836.75	16%	38,106,230.38
EXPENSE TOTALS	37,977,490.00	135,516.00	38,113,006.00	2,935,674.15	(36.00)	6,339,629.78	31,773,412.22	17%	38,052,245.51
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Intergov Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
Public Charges	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	30,000.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	195,277.00	.00	195,277.00	66,425.00	.00	.00	195,277.00	0	69,675.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$195,277.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	\$66,425.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	0%	\$99,675.00
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	185,817.00	.00	185,817.00	7,599.53	.00	14,934.24	170,882.76	8	89,356.34
Operating Expenses	9,460.00	.00	9,460.00	117.78	.00	477.98	8,982.02	5	4,541.06
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$195,277.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	\$7,717.31	\$0.00	\$15,412.22	\$179,864.78	8%	\$93,897.40
Fund 150 - DARE									
REVENUE									
Property taxes	195,277.00	.00	195,277.00	66,425.00	.00	.00	195,277.00	0%	99,675.00
Intergov Revenue	195,277.00	.00	195,277.00	7,717.31	.00	15,412.22	179,864.78	8%	93,897.40
Public Charges	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,707.69	\$0.00	(\$15,412.22)	\$15,412.22		\$5,777.60
REVENUE TOTALS	\$195,277.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	\$7,717.31	\$0.00	\$15,412.22	\$179,864.78	8%	\$93,897.40
EXPENSE									
Personnel Costs	38,172,767.00	135,515.00	38,308,282.00	3,531,070.38	.00	6,185,168.25	32,123,113.75	16%	38,205,905.38
Operating Expenses	38,172,767.00	135,516.00	38,308,283.00	2,943,391.46	(36.00)	6,355,042.00	31,953,277.00	17%	38,146,142.91
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$76,345,534.00	\$271,031.00	\$76,616,565.00	\$6,474,461.84	(\$72.00)	\$12,539,210.25	\$64,077,354.75	17%	\$76,352,047.29
Grand Totals									
REVENUE TOTALS	\$38,172,767.00	\$135,515.00	\$38,308,282.00	\$3,531,070.38	.00	\$6,185,168.25	\$32,123,113.75	16%	\$38,205,905.38
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$76,345,534.00	\$271,031.00	\$76,616,565.00	\$6,474,461.84	(\$72.00)	\$12,539,210.25	\$64,077,354.75	17%	\$76,352,047.29

Brown County
Sheriff's Office
Budget Status Report

BUDGET STATUS REPORT - UNAUDITED

	Amended Annual Budget	YTD Actual	% Used/ Received
Personnel Costs	29,053,755	6,849,644	24%
Operating Expenses	8,943,300	2,454,590	27%
Outlay	364,388	283,163	78%
Property Taxes	29,063,107	7,265,777	25%
Intergovernmental Revenue	6,712,659	1,493,659	22%
Public Charges	1,913,662	449,575	23%
Miscellaneous Revenue	435,339	45,670	10%
Other Financing Sources	236,675	166,676	70%

Incl. Sheriff's Office and DARE fund combined


HIGHLIGHTS:

Expenses: Overall expenses through March were at 25.0% of budget, which is roughly what would be expected through two months. Outlay is at 83% (77.7% excluding encumbrances) due to those expenses weighted more heavily early in the year.

Revenues: Overall revenues through March were 24.6% of budget. This is comparable to this point last year when revenues were at 24.7% of budget. Overall through March, revenues are \$166,040.56 less than expenses.

Sheriff's Office -
March, 2017

Amended Annual Budget YTD Actual





Sheriff's Office - Budget by Account Classification

Report

Through 03/31/17

Prior Fiscal Year Activity Included

Summary Listing

Account Classification										
Fund 100 - General Fund										
Adopted	Budget	Amendments	Budget	Amended	Current Month	Encumbrances	YTD	Transactions	Budget - YTD	% Used/
					Transactions				Transactions	Rec'd
Fund 100 - General Fund										
REVENUE										
Property taxes	29,063,107.00	.00	29,063,107.00	2,421,925.57	.00	.00	7,265,776.71	21,797,330.29	25	28,172,763.00
Intergov Revenue	6,690,659.00	22,000.00	6,712,659.00	524,114.24	.00	.00	1,493,658.50	5,219,000.50	22	6,700,562.87
Public Charges	1,913,662.00	.00	1,913,662.00	167,631.32	.00	.00	449,575.04	1,464,086.96	23	1,978,838.33
Miscellaneous Revenue	240,062.00	.00	240,062.00	14,494.04	.00	.00	45,670.37	194,391.73	19	308,722.79
Other Financing Sources	70,000.00	156,675.00	226,675.00	108,022.50	.00	.00	166,675.50	69,999.50	70	945,348.39
REVENUE TOTALS	\$37,977,490.00	\$188,675.00	\$38,166,165.00	\$3,236,187.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,421,356.02	\$28,744,806.98	25%	\$38,106,235.38
EXPENSE										
Personnel Costs	28,754,422.00	113,516.00	28,867,938.00	2,151,731.36	.00	.00	6,827,477.17	22,040,460.83	24	29,138,457.03
Operating Expenses	8,910,844.00	22,996.00	8,933,840.00	790,227.46	.00	.00	2,454,111.43	6,479,728.57	27	8,336,391.48
Outlay	312,224.00	52,164.00	364,388.00	283,162.50	17,830.00	17,830.00	283,162.50	63,395.50	83	577,397.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$37,977,490.00	\$188,676.00	\$38,166,166.00	\$3,225,121.32	\$17,830.00	\$17,830.00	\$9,564,751.10	\$28,581,584.90	25%	\$38,052,245.51
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS	\$37,977,490.00		\$38,166,165.00	\$3,236,187.77			\$9,421,356.02	\$28,744,806.98	25%	\$38,106,235.38
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$37,977,490.00		\$38,166,166.00	\$3,225,121.32		\$17,830.00	\$9,564,751.10	\$28,581,584.90	25%	\$38,052,245.51
Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	(\$1.00)	(\$1.00)	\$11,066.45	(\$17,830.00)	(\$17,830.00)	(\$143,395.08)	\$161,224.08		\$53,989.87
Fund 150 - DARE										
REVENUE										
Property taxes	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Intergov Revenue	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Public Charges	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	195,277.00	.00	195,277.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	195,277.00	0	69,675.00
Other Financing Sources	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
REVENUE TOTALS	\$195,277.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	0%	\$99,675.00
EXPENSE										
Personnel Costs	185,817.00	.00	185,817.00	7,232.92	.00	.00	22,167.16	163,649.84	12	89,156.34
Operating Expenses	9,460.00	.00	9,460.00	.34	.00	.00	478.32	8,981.68	5	4,541.06
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$195,277.00	\$0.00	\$195,277.00	\$7,233.26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,645.48	\$172,631.52	12%	\$93,897.40
Fund 150 - DARE Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS	\$195,277.00		\$195,277.00	\$0.00			\$0.00	\$195,277.00	0%	\$99,675.00
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$195,277.00		\$195,277.00	\$7,233.26			\$22,645.48	\$172,631.52	12%	\$93,897.40
Fund 150 - DARE Totals	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,233.26)	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$22,645.48)	\$22,645.48		\$5,777.60
Grand Totals										
REVENUE TOTALS	\$38,172,767.00	\$188,675.00	\$38,361,442.00	\$3,236,187.77			\$9,421,356.02	\$28,940,085.98	25%	\$38,205,910.38
EXPENSE TOTALS	\$38,172,767.00	\$188,676.00	\$38,361,443.00	\$3,232,354.58	\$17,830.00	\$17,830.00	\$9,587,396.58	\$28,756,216.42	25%	\$38,146,142.91
Grand Totals	\$0.00	(\$1.00)	(\$1.00)	\$3,833.19	(\$17,830.00)	(\$17,830.00)	(\$166,040.56)	\$183,869.56		\$59,767.47

17-22

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

Category

Approval Level

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Reallocation from one account to another in the same level of appropriation | Dept Head |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Reallocation due to a technical correction that could include: | Director of Admin |
| • Reallocation to another account strictly for tracking or accounting purposes | |
| • Allocation of budgeted prior year grant not completed in the prior year | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Any change in any item within the Outlay account which does not require the reallocation of funds from another level of appropriation | County Exec |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Any change in appropriation from an official action taken by the County Board (i.e., resolution, ordinance change, etc.) | County Exec |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 a) Reallocation of <u>up to 10%</u> of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts) | Admin Committee |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 b) Reallocation of <u>more than 10%</u> of the funds original appropriated between any of the levels of appropriation. | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board <i>W</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Any allocation from a department's fund balance | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9 Any allocation from the County's General Fund | Oversight Comm
Admin Committee
2/3 County Board |

Justification for Budget Change:

In order to address Jail overcrowding issues, the Juvenile population was moved to a smaller pod, resulting in a loss of physical activity area for the juveniles. The purchase of some exercise equipment would make up for this. The Juvenile Superintendent has identified the cost of such equipment to be \$1,552. This has been reviewed by the courts and they have indicated the funding can come from an account they have accumulated from fines/fees collected in the past several years for juvenile expenses. Those funds would be in effect transferred to the Sheriff/Jail budget. Affected accounts are listed below.

Financial impact: \$1,552 – no tax levy funding involved.

Amount: \$1,552

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.072.001.4502	Other law & ordinance violations	1,552.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.072.001.5300	Supplies	1,552.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

AUTHORIZATIONS

Department: Sheriff

Date: 03/08/17

Date: 3/13/17

26



WILLIAM M. ATKINSON
Presiding Judge

Holly Malvitz
Office Manager
(920) 448-4146

CIRCUIT COURT BRANCH VIII

BROWN COUNTY COURTHOUSE
100 S. JEFFERSON STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600

February 21, 2017

Neil Basten
Financial Operations Manager
Brown County Clerk of Court's Office

Re: Teen Court Contributions Fund

Dear Neil:

The Judges have agreed to take money from the Teen Court Contributions fund to purchase exercise equipment for the Brown County Jail, Juvenile Department. The cost is \$1,552.21. Please have the accounts payable department remit a check to the following: *

Brown County Sheriff's Office
2684 Development Drive
Green Bay, WI 54311

Thank you.

* may be done by journal
entry rather than
physical check Bk

WMA/Py MB 3/3/17

100.2006

Sincerely,

William M. Atkinson
Honorable William M. Atkinson
Presiding Judge, Brown County

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

CategoryApproval Level

- ☐ 1 Reallocation from one account to another in the same level of appropriation
Dept Head
- ☐ 2 Reallocation due to a technical correction that could include:
Director of Admin
- Reallocation to another account strictly for tracking or accounting purposes
 - Allocation of budgeted prior year grant not completed in the prior year
- ☐ 3 Any change in any item within the Outlay account which does not require the reallocation of funds from another level of appropriation
County Exec
- ☐ 4 Any change in appropriation from an official action taken by the County Board (i.e., resolution, ordinance change, etc.)
County Exec
- ☐ 5 a) Reallocation of up to 10% of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts)
Admin Committee
- ☐ 5 b) Reallocation of more than 10% of the funds original appropriated between any of the levels of appropriation.
Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board
- ☐ 6 Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount
Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board
- ☒ 7 Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue
Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board
- ☐ 8 Any allocation from a department's fund balance
Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board
- ☐ 9 Any allocation from the County's General Fund
Oversight Comm
Admin Committee
2/3 County Board

Justification for Budget Change:

This request is to increase overtime and fringe benefits to reflect participation in a Click It Or Ticket/Speed Enforcement Task Force grant from the Wis. DOT BOTS Office. This grant passes through the Green Bay Police Dept. and is shared by five county agencies. Increased expenses for overtime patrols are offset by grant revenue.

This is an annual grant program that has been provided to the County in prior years. However, it was not included in the 2017 budget because the amount had not been determined when the budget was created. This adjustment is for only the calendar year 2017 portion - \$36,500 estimated Brown County share.

Fiscal Impact: Increase revenues \$36,000 offset by increase in expenses of \$36,000 Amount: \$36,000

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.4301	Federal grants	\$36,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.5103.000	Premium Overtime	30,600
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.5110.100	Fringe Benefits - FICA	5,400
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

AUTHORIZATIONS

Department: SALESDate: 03/17/17

Signature of BDA or Executive

Date: 3/21/17

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

Category	Approval Level
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Reallocation from one account to another in the same level of appropriation	Dept Head
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Reallocation due to a technical correction that could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reallocation to another account strictly for tracking or accounting purposes • Allocation of budgeted prior year grant not completed in the prior year 	Director of Admin
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Any change in any item within the Outlay account which does not require the reallocation of funds from another level of appropriation	County Exec
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Any change in appropriation from an official action taken by the County Board (i.e., resolution, ordinance change, etc.)	County Exec
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 a) Reallocation of <u>up to 10%</u> of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts)	Admin Committee
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 b) Reallocation of <u>more than 10%</u> of the funds original appropriated between any of the levels of appropriation.	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7 Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Any allocation from a department's fund balance	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> 9 Any allocation from the County's General Fund	Oversight Comm Admin Committee 2/3 County Board


Justification for Budget Change:


This request is to increase overtime and fringe benefits to reflect participation in an Alcohol Enforcement grant from the Wis. DOT BOTS Office. This grant passes through the Green Bay Police Dept. Increased expenses for overtime patrols are offset by grant revenue.

This is an annual grant program that has been provided to the County in prior years. However, it was not included in the 2017 budget because the amount had not been determined when the budget was created. This adjustment is for only the calendar year 2017 portion - \$50,000 allocation.

Fiscal Impact: Increase revenues \$50,000 offset by increase in expenses of \$50,000. Amount: \$50,000

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.4301	Federal grants	\$50,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.5103.000	Premium Overtime	42,500
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.5110.100	Fringe Benefits - FICA	7,500
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			


 Department: Sheriff's
 Date: 03/17/17

AUTHORIZATIONS

 Date: 3/21/17

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

CategoryApproval Level

- ☐ 1 Reallocation from one account to another in the same level of appropriation Dept Head
- ☐ 2 Reallocation due to a technical correction that could include: Director of Admin
- Reallocation to another account strictly for tracking or accounting purposes
 - Allocation of budgeted prior year grant not completed in the prior year
- ☐ 3 Any change in any item within the Outlay account which does not require the reallocation of funds from another level of appropriation County Exec
- ☐ 4 Any change in appropriation from an official action taken by the County Board (i.e., resolution, ordinance change, etc.) County Exec
- ☐ 5 a) Reallocation of up to 10% of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts) Admin Committee
- ☐ 5 b) Reallocation of more than 10% of the funds original appropriated between any of the levels of appropriation. Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
- ☐ 6 Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
- ☒ 7 Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
- ☐ 8 Any allocation from a department's fund balance Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
- ☐ 9 Any allocation from the County's General Fund Oversight Comm Admin Committee 2/3 County Board

Justification for Budget Change:

This request is to increase overtime and fringe benefits to reflect participation in an OWI Task Force grant from the Wis. DOT BOTS Office. This grant passes through the Green Bay Police Dept. and is shared by six county agencies. Increased expenses for overtime patrols are offset by grant revenue.

This is an annual grant program that has been provided to the County in prior years. However, it was not included in the 2017 budget because the amount had not been determined when the budget was created. This adjustment is for only the calendar year 2017 portion - \$24,000 estimated Brown County share.

Fiscal impact: Increase revenues \$24,000 offset by increase in expenses of \$24,000.

Amount: \$24,000

<u>Increase</u>	<u>Decrease</u>	<u>Account #</u>	<u>Account Title</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.4301	Federal grants	\$24,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.5103.000	Premium Overtime	20,400
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.070.5110.100	Fringe Benefits - FICA	3,600
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

AUTHORIZATIONS

Department: Shift

Date: 03/17/17

Date: 3/21/17

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

CategoryApproval Level

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Reallocation from one account to another in the same level of appropriation | Dept Head |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Reallocation due to a technical correction that could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reallocation to another account strictly for tracking or accounting purposes • Allocation of budgeted prior year grant not completed in the prior year | Director of Admin |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Any change in any item within the Outlay account which does not require the reallocation of funds from another level of appropriation | County Exec |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | Any change in appropriation from an official action taken by the County Board (i.e. resolution, ordinance change, etc.) | County Exec |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 a) | Reallocation of <u>up to 10%</u> of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts) | Admin Committee |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 b) | Reallocation of <u>more than 10%</u> of the funds original appropriated between any of the levels of appropriation. | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7 | Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8 | Any allocation from a department's fund balance | Oversight Comm
2/3 County Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | Any allocation from the County's General Fund | Oversight Comm
Admin Committee
2/3 County Board |

Justification for Budget Change:

This 2017 budget request is to increase federal grant revenue and related grant expenses to participate in a Homeland Security ALERT EOD training grant (2016-HSW-10905) that provides funding for EOD Technicians from State Agencies to attend the 2017 International In-Service Training in Green Bay in June of 2017.

Fiscal Impact: \$6,000 – Increase revenue and offsetting increase expense

Amount: \$6,000

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.074.4301	Federal grant revenue	6,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.074.074.5340	Travel & Training	6,000
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

AUTHORIZATIONS

Department: Smith

Date: 04/20/17

Date: 4/24/17

March 15, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO CLASSIFY COUNTY JAILERS
AS PROTECTIVE OCCUPATION PARTICIPANTS (POPs) FOR WRS PURPOSES**

WHEREAS, under current law, County Jailers are not considered Protective Occupation Participants (POPs) for Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) purposes, since their duties do not involve active law enforcement or active fire suppression or prevention; and

WHEREAS, as a result of not being classified as POPs, County Jailers have a higher minimum retirement age than POPs, and have a lower percentage multiplier used when calculating retirement benefits, which results in County Jailers receiving a lower Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) retirement benefit than POPs receive; and

WHEREAS, the Public Safety Committee believes it is beneficial for legislation to be passed that allows for the classification of County Jailers as POPs, as long as said legislation results in no net increased costs to the county by requiring County Jailers classified as POPs to pay all additional employer costs resulting from their classification as POPs; and

WHEREAS, the Public Safety Committee supports and approves of this Resolution, and desires that the Brown County Board of Supervisors approve of and pass this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors that the Board of Supervisors encourages the Wisconsin State Legislature to draft and pass legislation that allows for the classification of County Jailers as POPs, as long as said legislation results in no net increased costs to the county by requiring County Jailers classified as POPs to pay all additional employer costs resulting from their classification as POPs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors that the Brown County Clerk shall forward this resolution to Brown County's State Legislative Delegation for consideration.

Fiscal Note: This resolution does not have a fiscal impact, and therefore does not require an appropriation from the General Fund.

Respectfully submitted,
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Approved By:

TROY STRECKENBACH
COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authored by Corporation Counsel

Approved by Corporation Counsel Office

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROLL CALL # _____

Motion made by Supervisor _____

Seconded by Supervisor _____

SUPERVISORS	DIST.	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
SIEBER	1				
DE WANE	2				
NICHOLSON	3				
HOYER	4				
GRUSZYNSKI	5				
LEFEBVRE	6				
ERICKSON	7				
ZIMA	8				
EVANS	9				
VANDER LEESE	10				
BUCKLEY	11				
LANDWEHR	12				
DANTINNE, JR	13				

SUPERVISORS	DIST.	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
BRUSKY	14				
BALLARD	15				
KASTER	16				
VAN DYCK	17				
LINSEN	18				
KNEISZEL	19				
CLANCY	20				
CAMPBELL	21				
MOYNIHAN, JR.	22				
BLOM	23				
SCHADEWALD	24				
LUND	25				
BECKER	26				

Total Votes Cast _____

Motion: Adopted _____ Defeated _____ Tabled _____

CORPORATION COUNSEL

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600



David P. Hemery
Corporation Counsel

PHONE (920) 448-4006
FAX (920) 448-4003
David.Hemery@co.brown.wi.us

RESOLUTION/ORDINANCE SUBMISSION TO COUNTY BOARD

DATE: 01-26-2017
REQUEST TO: Public Safety Committee & County Board
MEETING DATE: 02-01-2017 & 02-15-2017
REQUEST FROM: John Gossage (per Pat Buckley and Pat Moynihan)
Brown County Sheriff

REQUEST TYPE: ☒ New resolution ☐ Revision to resolution
☐ New ordinance ☐ Revision to ordinance

TITLE: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO CLASSIFY COUNTY JAILERS AS PROTECTIVE OCCUPATION PARTICIPANTS (POPs) FOR WRS PURPOSES

ISSUE/BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

To SUPPORT LEGISLATION TO CLASSIFY COUNTY JAILERS AS PROTECTIVE OCCUPATION PARTICIPANTS (POPs) FOR WRS PURPOSES so they may retire earlier and receive a larger retirement benefit at no cost to county

ACTION REQUESTED:

For Public Safety Committee and County Board to pass proposed resolution

FISCAL IMPACT:

NOTE: This fiscal impact portion is initially completed by requestor, but verified by the DOA and updated if necessary.

1. Is there a fiscal impact? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - a. If yes, what is the amount of the impact? \$ _____
 - b. If part of a bigger project, what is the total amount of the project?
\$ _____
 - c. Is it currently budgeted? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 1. If yes, in which account? _____
 2. If no, how will the impact be funded?

X COPY OF RESOLUTION OR ORDINANCE IS ATTACHED